National Anti-Slavery Standard.

VOL. XVI. NO. 48. NEW YORK, SATURDAY, APRIL 19, 1856. WHOLE NO. 828.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, ON SATURDAY,

AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM,

BY THE

AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

At its Office, 138 Nassau St., New York,

AND AT THE OFFICE OF THE

PENNSYLVANIA ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

31 *North Fifth St., Philadelphia.*

Advertisements inserted at $1 per square for the first insertion, and 25 cents for every subsequent one. For advertisements less than a square, 50 cents for each insertion.

Selections.

SPEECH OF HON. WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

[In the U. S. Senate, on Wednesday, April 9th, Mr. SEWARD delivered an able Speech in favour of the immediate admission of Kansas to the Union, in compliance with the wish of the people of that Territory, as expressed through their newly organized State government. Mr. Seward, after a felicitous exordium, thus states the purpose and the method of his speech:]

THE President of the United States has been an accessory to these political transactions, with full complicity in regard to the purpose for which they were committed. He has adopted the usurpation, and made it his own, and he is now maintaining it with the military arm of the Republic. Thus Kansas has been revolutionized, and she now lies subjugated and prostrate at the foot of the President of the United States, while he, through the agency of a foreign tyranny established within her borders, is forcibly introducing and establishing slavery there, in contempt and defiance of the organic law. These extraordinary transactions have been attended by civil commotions, in which property, life, and liberty, have been exposed to violence, and these commotions still continue to threaten not only the Territory itself, but also the adjacent States, with the calamities and disgraces of civil war. I am fully aware of the gravity of the charges against the President of the United States which this statement of the condition and relations of Kansas imports. I shall proceed, without fear and without reserve, to make them good. The maxim, that a sacred veil must be drawn over the beginning of all Governments, does not hold under our system. I shall first call the accuser into the presence of the Senate—then examine the defences which the President has made—and, last, submit the evidences by which he is convicted. The people of Kansas know whether these charges are true or false. They have adopted them, and, on the ground of the high political necessity which the wrongs they have endured, and are yet enduring, and the dangers through which they have already passed, and the perils to which they are yet exposed, have created, they have provisionally organized themselves as a State, and that State is now here, by its two chosen Senators and one Representative, standing outside the doors of Congress, applying to be admitted into the Union, as a means of relief indispensable for the purposes of peace, freedom and safety. This new State is the President's responsible accuser.

[Mr. Seward proceeds to review the conduct of the President, laying bare the proofs of his complicity with the designs of Atchison and his horde of "Border Ruffians." Of the denunciations hurled at the Abolitionists and the advocates of Freedom for Kansas in the President's message, he says:]

The President assails and stigmatizes those who defend and maintain the cause of Kansas as "men of narrow views and sectional purposes," "engaged in those wild and chimerical schemes of social change which are generated one after another in the unstable minds of visionary sophists and interested agitators"—"mad men, raising the storm of frenzy and faction," "sectional agitators," "enemies of the Constitution, who have surrendered themselves so far to a fanatical devotion to the supposed interests of the relatively few Africans in the United States as totally to abandon and disregard the interests of the twenty-five millions of Americans, and trample under foot the injunctions of moral and constitutional obligation, and to engage in plans of vindictive hostility against those who are associated with them in the enjoyment of the common heritage of our free institutions." Sir, the President's defence on this occasion, if not a matter simply personal, is at least one of temporary and ephemeral importance. Possibly, all the advantages he will gain by transferring to his accuser a portion of the popular prejudice against Abolition and Abolitionists can be spared to him. It would be wise, however, for those whose interests are inseparable from slavery to reflect that abolition will gain an equivalent benefit from the identification of the President's defence with their cherished institution. Abolition is a slow, but irrepressible, uprising of principles of natural justice and humanity, obnoxious to prejudice, because they conflict inconveniently with existing material, social and political interests. It belongs to others than statesmen, charged with the care of present interests, to conduct the social reformation of mankind in its broadest bearings. I leave to Abolitionists their own work of self-vindication. I may, however, remind slaveholders that there is a time when oppression and persecution cease to be effectual against such movements; and then the odium they have before unjustly incurred becomes an element of strength and power. Christianity, blindly maligned during three centuries, by Prætors, Governors, Senates, Councils and Emperors, towered above its enemies in a fourth; and even the cross on which its Founder had expired, and which, therefore, was the emblem of its shame, became the sign under which it went forth evermore thereafter, conquering and to conquer. Abolition is only yet in its first century. The President raises, in his defence, a false issue, and elaborates an irrelevant argument to prove that Congress has no right or power, nor has any sister State any right or power, to interfere within a slave State, by legislation or force, to abolish slavery therein—as if you or I, or any other responsible man, ever maintained the contrary. The President distorts the Constitution from its simple text, so as to make it expressly and directly defend, protect and guarantee African slavery. Thus he alleges that "the Government" which resulted from the Revolution was a "Federal Republic of the free white men of the Colonies," whereas, on the contrary, the Declaration of Independence asserts the political equality of all men, and even the Constitution itself carefully avoids any political recognition not merely of slavery, but of the diversity of races. The President represents the Fathers as having contemplated and provided for a permanent increase of the number of slaves in some of the States, and therefore forbidden Congress to touch slavery in the way of attack or offence, and as having, therefore, also placed it under the general safeguard of the Constitution; whereas the Fathers, by authorizing Congress to abolish the African slave trade after 1808, as a means of attack, inflicted on slavery in the States a blow, of which they expected it to languish immediately, and ultimately to expire. The President closes his defence, in the annual message, with a deliberate assault, very incongruous in such a place, upon some of the Northern States. At the same time he abstains, with marked caution, from naming the accused States. They, however, receive a compliment at his hands, by way of giving keenness to his rebuke, which enables us to identify them. They are Northern States "which were conspicuous in founding the Republic." All of the original Northern States were conspicuous in that great transaction. All of them, therefore, are accused. The offence charged is, that they disregard their constitutional obligations, and, although "conscious of their inability to heal admitted and palpable social evils of their own confessedly within their jurisdiction, they engage in an offensive, hopeless and illegal undertaking, to reform the domestic institutions of the Southern States, at the peril of the very existence of the Constitution, and of all the countless benefits which it has conferred." I challenge the President to the proof, in behalf of Massachusetts; although I have only the interest common to all Americans and to all men in her great fame. What one corporate or social evil is there, of which she is conscious also of inability to heal it? Is it ignorance, prejudice, bigotry, vice, public disorder, poverty or disease afflicting the minds or the bodies of her people? There she stands. Survey her universities, colleges, academies, observatories, primary schools, Sunday schools, penal codes and penitentiaries. Descend into her quarries, walk over her fields and through her gardens, observe her manufactories of a thousand various fabrics, watch her steamers ascending every river and inlet on your own coast, and her ships displaying their canvass on every sea; follow her fishermen in their adventurous voyages from her own adjacent bays to the icy ocean under either pole; and then return and enter her hospitals, which cure or relieve suffering humanity in every condition and at every period of life, from the lying-in to the second childhood, and which not only restore sight to the blind, and hearing to the deaf, and speech to the dumb, but also bring back wandering reason to the insane, and teach even the idiot to think! Massachusetts, Sir, is a model of States, worthy of all honour; and though she was most conspicuous of all the States in the establishment of republican institutions here, she is even more conspicuous still for the municipal wisdom with which she has made them contribute to the welfare of her people, and to the greatness of the Republic itself. In behalf of New York, for whom it is my right and duty to speak, I defy the Presidential accuser. Mark her tranquil magnanimity, which becomes a State for whose delivery from tyranny Schuyler devised and laboured, who received her political Constitution from Hamilton, her intellectual and physical development from Clinton, and her lessons in humanity from Jay. As she waves her wand over the continent, trade forsakes the broad natural channels which conveyed it before to the Delaware and Chesapeake Bays and to the Gulfs of St. Lawrence and of Mexico, and, obediently to her command, pours itself through her artificial channels into her own once obscure seaport. She stretches her wand again towards the ocean, and the commerce of all the continents concentrates itself at her feet; and with it, strong and full floods of immigration ride in contributing labour, capital, art, valour and enterprise, to perfect and embellish our ever-widening empire. When, and on what occasion, has Massachusetts or New York officiously and illegally intruded herself within the jurisdiction of sister States, to modify or reform their institutions? No, no, Sir. Their faults have been quite different. They have conceded too often and too much for their own just dignity and influence in Federal administration, to the querulous complaints of the States in whose behalf the President arraigns them. I thank the President for the insult which, though so deeply unjust, was perhaps needful to arouse them to their duty in this great emergency. The President, in this connection, reviews the acquisitions of new domain, the organization of new Territories, and the admission of new States, and arrives at results which must be as agreeably surprising to the slave States as they are astounding to the free States. He finds that the former have been altogether guiltless of political ambition, while he convicts the latter not only of unjust territorial aggrandizement, but also of false and fraudulent clamour against the slave States, to cover their own aggressions. Notwithstanding the President's elaborated misconceptions, these historical facts remain, namely—that no acquisition whatever has ever been made at the instance of the free States, and with a view to their aggrandizement; that Louisiana and Florida, incidentally acquired for general and important national objects, have already yielded to the slave States three States of their own class, while Texas was avowedly annexed as a means of security to slavery, and one slave State has been already admitted from that acquisition, and Congress has stipulated for the admission of four more; that, by way of equivalent for the admission of California a free State, the slave States have obtained a virtual repeal of the Mexican law which forbade slavery in New Mexico and Utah; and that, as a consequence of that extraordinary legislation, Congress has also rescinded the prohibition of slavery, which, in 1820, was extended over all of that part of Louisiana, except Missouri, which lies north of 36° 30′ of north latitude. Sir, the real crime of the Northern States is this: they have forty degrees too much of north latitude.

[The Emigrant Aid Societies Mr. Seward defends in a manner at once earnest and conclusive.]

The President then proceeds to launch severe denunciations against what he calls a propagandist attempt to colonize the Territory with opponents of slavery. The whole American Continent has been undergoing a process of colonization, in many forms, throughout a period of three hundred and fifty years. The only common element of all those forms was propagandism. Were not the voyages of Columbus propagandist expeditions, under the auspices of the Pope of Rome? Was not the wide occupation of Spanish America a propagandism of the Catholic Church? The settlement of Massachusetts by the Pilgrims; of the New Netherlands by the Reformers of Holland; the later plantation of the Mohawk Valley by the Palatines; the establishment of Pennsylvania by the Friends; the mission of the Moravians at Bethlehem, in the same State; the foundation of Maryland by Lord Baltimore and his colony of British Catholics; the settlement of Jamestown by the Cavaliers and Churchmen of England; that of South Carolina by the Huguenots: Were not all these propagandist colonizations? Was not Texas settled by a colony of slaveholders, and California by companies of freemen? Yet never before did any Prince, King, Emperor, or President, denounce such colonizations. Does any law of nature or nations forbid them? Does any public authority quarantine, on the ground of opinion, the ships which are continually pouring into the gates of New York whole religious societies from Ireland, Wales, Germany and Norway, with their pastors, and clerks and choirs? But the President charges that the propagandists entered Kansas with a design to "anticipate and force the determination of the slavery question within the Territory" (in favour of freedom), forgetting, nevertheless, that he has only just before deplored a failure of his own to anticipate and favour the determination of that question in favour of slavery, by a *coup-de-main*, in advance even of their departure from their homes in the Atlantic States and in Europe. He charges, moreover, that the propagandists designed to prevent the free and natural action of the inhabitants in the intended organization of the Territory, when, in fact, they were pursuing the only free and natural course to organize it, by immigrating and becoming permanent inhabitants, citizens, and electors of Kansas. Not one unlawful or turbulent act has been hitherto charged against any one of the propagandists of freedom. * * * * * To emigrate from one State or Territory singly, or in company with others, with or without incorporation by statute, is a right of every citizen of the United States, as it is a right of every freeman in the world. The State that denies this right is a tyranny—the subject to whom it is denied is a slave. Such free emigration is the chief element of American progress and civilization. Without it, there could be no community, no political Territory, no State in Kansas. Without it, there could have been no United States of America. To retain and carry into Kansas cherished political as well as moral, social and religious convictions, is a right of every emigrant. Must emigrants to that Territory carry there only their persons, and leave behind their minds and souls, disembodied and wandering in their native lands? They only are fit founders of a State who exercise independence of opinion; and it is to the exercise of that right that our new States, equally with all the older ones, owe their intelligence and vigour.

> "There are who, distant from their native soil,
> Still for their own and country's glory toil;
> While some, fast rooted to their parent spot,
> In life are useless, and in death, forgot."

It is not morally wrong for Massachusetts to aid her sons, by a charter, to do what in itself is innocent and commendable. The President and the majority of the Committee maintain that such associations are in violation of national or at least of international laws. Here is the Constitution of the United States, and here are the Statutes at Large, in ten volumes, octavo. Let the President or defenders point out the inhibition. They specify, particularly, that the action of the State violates a law of comity, which regulates the intercourse of independent States, and especially the intercourse between the members of the Federal Union. Here are Vattel and Burlamaqui. Let them point out in these pages this law of comity. There is no law of comity which forbids nations from permitting and encouraging emigration, on the ground of opinion. Moreover, slavery is an outlaw under the law of nations. Still further, the Constitution of the United States has expressly incorporated into itself all of the laws of comity, for regulating the intercourse between independent States, which it deems proper to adopt. Whatever is forbidden expressly by the Constitution is unlawful. Whatever is not forbidden is lawful. The supposed law of comity is not incorporated into the Constitution. With the aid of the Committee on Territories, we discover that the emigrants from Massachusetts have violated the supposed national laws, not by any unlawful conduct of their own, but by provoking the unlawful and flagitious conduct of the invaders of Kansas. "They passed through Missouri in large numbers, using violent language, and giving unmistakeable indications of their hostility to the domestic institutions of that State," and thus "they created apprehensions that the object of the Emigrant Aid Company was to *abolitionize* Kansas, as a means of prosecuting a relentless warfare upon the institution of slavery within the limits of Missouri, which apprehensions, increasing with the progress of events, ultimately became settled convictions of the people of Western Missouri." Missouri builds railroads, steamboats and wharves. It cannot be, therefore, that the mere "largeness of the numbers" of the Eastern travellers offended or alarmed the borderers. I confess my surprise that the sojourners used violent language. It seems unlike them. I confess my greater surprise that the borderers were disturbed so deeply by mere words. It seem unlike them. Which of the domestic institutions of Missouri were those against which the travellers manifested determined hostility? Not certainly her manufactories, banks, railroads, churches and schools. All these are domestic institutions held in high respect by the men of Massachusetts, and are just such ones as these emigrants are now establishing in Kansas. It was, therefore, African slavery alone, a peculiar domestic institution of Missouri, against which their hostility was directed. Waiving a suspicious want of proof of the unwise conduct charged against them, I submit that clearly they did not thereby endanger that peculiar institution in Missouri, for they passed directly through that State into Kansas. How, then, were the borderers provoked? The Missourians inferred, from the language and demeanour of the travellers, that they would *abolitionize* Kansas, and thereafter, by means of Kansas abolitionized, prosecute a relentless warfare against slavery in Missouri. Far-seeing statesmen are these Missouri borderers, but less deliberative than far-sighted. Kansas was not to be abolitionized. It had never been otherwise than abolitionized. Abolitionized Kansas would constitute no means for the prosecution of such a warfare. Missouri lies adjacent to abolitionized Iowa on the North, and to abolitionized Illinois on the East, yet neither of those States has ever been used for such designs. How could this fearful enemy prosecute a warfare against slavery in Missouri? Only by buying the plantations of her citizens at their own prices, and so qualifying themselves to speak their hostility through the ballot-boxes? Could apprehensions so absurd justify the invasion of Kansas? Are the people of Kansas to be disfranchised and trodden down by the President of the United States, in punishment for any extravagance of emigrants, in Missouri, on the way to that Territory?

[After showing that "Kansas is now in the very act of revolution against a tyranny of the President of the United States, identical in all its prominent features with that tyranny of the King of England which gave birth to the American Revolution," Mr. Seward concludes with the following argument in favour of an immediate compliance with the earnest prayer of the People of the Territory for admission to the Union as a State.]

The people of Kansas, deprived of their sovereignty by a domestic tyranny, have, nevertheless, lawfully rescued it provisionally, and, so exercising it, have constituted themselves a State, and applied to Congress to admit them as such into the Federal Union. Congress has power to admit the new State thus organized. The favourable exercise of that power will terminate and crown the revolution. Once a State, the people of Kansas can preserve internal order, and defend themselves against invasion. Thus, the constitutional remedy is as effectual as it is peaceful and simple. This is the remedy for the evils existing in the Territory of Kansas, which I propose. Happily, there is no need to prove it to be either a lawful one or a proper one, or the only possible one. The President of the United States and the Committee on Territories unanimously concede all this broad ground, because he recommends it, and they adopt it. Wherein, then, do I differ from them? Simply thus: I propose to apply the remedy now, by admitting the new State with its present population and present Constitution. My opponents insist on postponing the measure until the Territory shall be conceded by the usurping authorities to contain 93,700 inhabitants, and until those authorities shall direct and authorize the people to organize a new State, under a new Constitution. In other words, I propose to allow the people of Kansas to apply the constitutional remedy at once. The President proposes to defer it indefinitely, and to commit the entire application of it to the hands of the Missouri borderers. He confesses the inadequacy of that course by asking appropriations of money to enable him to maintain and preserve order within the Territory until the indefinite period when the constitutional remedy shall be applied. There is no sufficient reason for the delay which the President advises. He admits the rightfulness and necessity of the remedy. It is as rightful and necessary now as it ever will be. It is demanded by the condition and circumstances of the people of Kansas now. You cannot justly postpone any more than you can justly deny that right. To postpone would be a denial. The President will need no grant of money, or armed men, to enforce obedience to law, when you shall have redressed the wrongs of which the people complain. Even under Governments less free than our own, there is no need of power where justice holds the helm. When justice is impartially administered, the obedience of the subject or citizen will be voluntary, cheerful, and practically unlimited. Freedom justly due cannot be conceded too soon. True freedom exists, the utmost bounds of civil liberty are obtained, only where complaints are freely heard, deeply considered, and speedily redressed. So only can you restore to Kansas the perfect freedom which you pledged, and she has lost. The Constitution does not prescribe 93,700, or any other number of people, as necessary to constitute a State. Besides, under the present ratio of increase, Kansas, whose population now is 40,000, will number 100,000 in a few months. The point made concerning numbers is therefore practically unimportant and frivolous. The President objects that the past proceedings, by which the new State of Kansas was organized, were irregular in three respects: First, That they were instituted, conducted and completed, without a previous permission by Congress, or by the local authorities within the Territory. Secondly, That they were instituted, conducted, and completed, by a party, and not by the whole people of Kansas; and, thirdly, That the new State holds an attitude of defiance and insubordination toward the Territorial authorities and the Federal Union. I reply, first, That if the proceeding in question were irregular and partisan-like and factious, the exigencies of the case would at least excuse the faults, and Congress has unlimited discretion to waive them. Secondly, The proceedings were not thus irregular, partisan-like and factious, because no act of Congress forbade them—no act of the Territorial Legislature forbade them, directly or by implication—nor had the Territorial Legislature power either to authorize or to prohibit them. The proceedings were, indeed, instituted by a party who favoured them. But they were prosecuted and consummated in the customary forms of popular elections, which were open to all the inhabitants of the Territory qualified to vote by the organic law, and by no others; and they have in no case come into conflict, nor does the new State now act or assume to engage in conflict with either the Territorial authorities or the Government of the Union. Third, There can be no irregularity where there is no law prescribing what shall be regular. Congress had passed no law establishing regulations for the organization or admission of new States. Precedents in such cases, being without foundation in law, are without authority. This is a country whose Government is regulated not by precedents, but by Constitutions. But if precedents were necessary, they are found in the cases of Texas and California, each of which was organized and admitted, subject to the same alleged irregularities. The majority of the Committee on Territories, in behalf of the President, interpose one further objection, by tracing this new State organization to the influence of a secret, armed, political society. Secrecy and combination, with extra-judicial oaths and armed power, were the enginery of the Missouri borderers in effecting the subjugation of the people of Kansas, as that machinery is always employed in the commission of political crimes. How far it was lawful or morally right for the people of Kansas to employ the same agencies for the defence of their lives and liberties may be a question for casuists, but certainly is not one for me. I can freely confess, however, my deep regret that secret societies for any purpose whatsoever have obtained a place among political organizations within the Republic; and it is my hope that the experience which we have now so distinctly had, that they can be but too easily adapted to unlawful, seditious, and dangerous enterprises, while they bring down suspicion and censure on high and noble causes when identified with them, may be sufficient to induce a general discontinuance of them. Will the Senate hesitate for an hour between the alternatives before them? The passions of the American people find healthful exercise in peaceful colonizations, and the construction of railroads, and the building up and multiplying of republican institutions. The Territory of Kansas lies across the path through which railroads must be built, and along which such institutions must be founded, without delay, in order to preserve the integrity of our Empire. Shall we suppress enterprises so benevolent and so healthful, and inflame our country with that fever of intestine war which exhausts and consumes not more the wealth and strength than the virtue and freedom of a nation? Shall we confess that the proclamation of popular sovereignty within the Territory of Kansas was not merely a failure, but was a pretence and a fraud? Or will Senators now contend that the people of Kansas, destitute as they are of a Legislature of their own, of Executive authorities of their own, of Judicial authorities of their own, of a militia of their own, of revenues of their own, subject to disposal by themselves, practically deprived as they are of the rights of voting, serving as jurors, and of writing, printing, and speaking their own opinions, are nevertheless in the enjoyment and exercise of popular sovereignty? Shall we confess before the world, after so brief a trial, that this great political system of ours is inadequate either to enable the majority to control through the operation of opinion, without force, or to give security to the citizen against tyranny and domestic violence? Are we prepared so soon to relinquish our simple and beautiful systems of republican government, and to substitute in their place the machinery of usurpation and despotism? The Congress of the United States can refuse admission to Kansas only on the ground that it will not relinquish the hope of carrying African slavery into that new Territory. If you are prepared to assume that ground, why not do it manfully and consistently, and establish slavery there by a direct and explicit act of Congress? But have we come to that stage of demoralization and degeneracy so soon? We, who commenced our political existence and gained the sympathies of the world by proclaiming to other nations that we held "These truths to be self-evident: That all men are born equal, and have certain inalienable rights; and that among these rights are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." We, who, in the spirit of that declaration, have assumed to teach and to illustrate, for the benefit of mankind, a higher and better civilization than they have hitherto known! If the Congress of the United States shall persist in this attempt, then they shall at least allow me to predict its results. Either you will not establish African slavery in Kansas or you will do it at the cost of the sacrifice of all the existing liberties of the American people. Even if slavery were, what it is not, a boon to the people of Kansas, they would reject it if enforced upon their acceptance by Federal guns. The attempt is in conflict with all the tendencies of the age. African slavery has for the last fifty years been giving way, as well in this country as in the islands and on the main land throughout this hemisphere. The political power and prestige of slavery in the United States are passing away. The slave States practically governed the Union directly for fifty years. They govern it now only indirectly, through the agency of Northern hands temporarily enlisted in their support. So much, owing to the decline of their power, they have already conceded to the free States. The next step, if they persist in their present course, will be the resumption and exercise by the free States of the control of the Government, without such concessions as they have hitherto made to obtain it. Throughout a period of nearly twenty years, the defenders of slavery screened it from discussion in the national councils. Now, they practically confess to the necessity for defending it here, by initiating discussion themselves. They have at once thrown away their most successful weapon, compromise, and worn out that one which was next in effectiveness, threats of secession from the Union. It is under such unpropitious circumstances that they begin the new experiment of extending slavery into free territory by force, by the armed power of the Federal Government. You will need many votes from free States in the House of Representatives, and even some votes from those States in this House, to send an army with a retinue of slaves in its train into Kansas. Have you counted up your votes in the two Houses? Have you calculated how long those who shall cast such votes will retain their places in the National Legislature? But I will grant, for the sake of the argument, that, with Federal battalions, you can carry slavery into Kansas, and maintain it there. Are you quite confident that this republican form of Government can then be upheld and preserved? You will then yourselves have introduced the Trojan horse. No republican government ever has endured with standing armies maintained in its bosom to enforce submission to its laws. A people who have once learned to relinquish their rights, under compulsion, will not be long in forgetting that they ever had any. In extending slavery into Kansas, therefore, by arms, you will subvert the liberties of the people. Senators of the free States, I appeal to you. Believe ye the prophets? I know you do. You know, then, that slavery neither works mines and quarries, nor founds cities, nor builds ships, nor levies armies, nor mans navies. Why, then, will you insist on closing up this new Territory of Kansas against all enriching streams of immigration, while you pour into it the turbid and poisonous waters of African slavery? Which one of you all, whether of Connecticut, of Pennsylvania, or of Illinois, or of Michigan, would consent thus to extinguish the chief light of civilization within the State in which your own fortunes are cast, and in which your own posterity is to live? Why will you pursue a policy so unkind, so ungenerous, and so unjust toward the helpless, defenceless, struggling Territory of Kansas, inhabited as it is by our own brethren, depending on you for protection and safety? Will slavery in Kansas add to the wealth or power of your own States, or to the wealth, power, or glory, of the Republic? You know that it will diminish all of these. You profess a desire to end this national debate about slavery, which has become, for you, intolerable. Is it not time to relinquish that hope? You have exhausted the virtue, for that purpose, that resided in compacts and platforms, in the suppression of the right of petition and in arbitrary parliamentary laws, and in abnegation of Federal authority over the subject of slavery within the National Territories. Will you even then end the debate by binding Kansas with chains for the safety of slavery in Missouri? Even then you must give over Utah to slavery, to make it secure and permanent in Kansas; and you must give over Oregon and Washington to both polygamy and slavery, so as to guarantee equally the one and the other of those peculiar domestic institutions in Utah; and so you must go on sacrificing on the shrine of peace Territory after Territory, until the prevailing nationality of freedom and of virtue shall be lost, and the vicious anomalies, which you have hitherto vainly hoped Almighty Wisdom would remove from among you without your own occurrence, shall become the controlling elements in the Republic. He who found a river in his path, and sat down for the flood to pass away, was not more unwise than he who expects the agitation of slavery to cease while the love of freedom animates the bosoms of mankind. The solemnity of the occasion draws over our heads that cloud of disunion which always arises whenever the subject of slavery is agitated. Still, the debate goes on, more ardently, earnestly and angrily, than ever before. It employs now not merely logic, reproach, menace, retort and defiance, but sabres, rifles and cannon. Do you look through this incipient war quite to the end, and see there peace, quiet, and harmony, on the subject of slavery? If so, pray enlighten me, and show me how long the way is which leads to that repose. The free States are loyal, and they always will remain so. Their foothold on this Continent is firm and sure. Their ability to maintain themselves, unaided, under the present Constitution, is established. The slave States, also, have been loyal hitherto, and I hope and trust they ever may remain so. But if disunion could ever come, it would come in the form of a secession of the slaveholding States; and it would come, then, when the slaveholding power, which is already firmly established on the Gulf of Mexico, and extends a thousand miles northward along both banks of the Mississippi, should have fixed its grappling irons upon the fountains of the Missouri and the slopes of the Rocky Mountains. Then that power would either be intolerably supreme in this Republic or it would strike for independence or exclusive domination. Then the free States and slave States of the Atlantic, divided and warring with each other, would disgust the free States of the Pacific, and they would have abundant cause and justification for withdrawing from a Union productive no longer of peace, safety, and liberty to themselves, and no longer holding up the cherished hopes of mankind. Mr. President, the Continental Congress of 1787, on resigning the trust, which it had discharged with signal fidelity, into the hands of the authorities elected under the new Constitution, and in taking leave of their constituents, addressed to the people of the United States this memorable injunction: "Let it never be forgotten that the cause of the United States has always been the cause of human nature." Let us recall that precious monition; let us examine the ways which we have pursued hitherto, under the light thrown upon them by that instruction. We shall find, in doing so, that we have forgotten moral right in the pursuit of material greatness, and we shall cease henceforth from practising upon ourselves the miserable delusion that we can safely extend Empire, when we shall have become reckless of the obligations of Eternal Justice, and faithless to the interests of Universal Freedom.

REMARKABLE ESCAPE OF A SLAVE.

Extract of a letter from PARKER PILLSBURY, dated Liverpool (Eng.), March 13, 1856:

A MOST interesting case of escapement has just turned up here in Liverpool. The boatswain of the ship Asterion, of New Orleans, when two days out from that port, discovered, stowed away among the cotton, a slave girl of about one or two and twenty years. He is a coloured man himself, and he contrived to conceal her so well as that she was not found until the ship reached Liverpool; nor then, only as a custom-house officer found her when searching the sailors' quarters for contraband tobacco. When she turned up, it was a somewhat larger plug than they were accustomed to find. The poor boatswain gave the officer a piece of gold, and he promised to keep silent. But he immediately reported him to the officers of the ship. The boatswain, however, knew his rights there, and dared to demand them; so he hurried the girl into a boat, and sent her on shore. She was taken into good hands, and supplied with clothing and other comforts, of which she stood in great need. She had suffered fearfully on the voyage, and, when taken from her hidingplace, was not able to walk a step. At one time on the passage she was near dying, and the boatswain was greatly alarmed. He gave her sea-water, and restored her somewhat, but she was more than a week quite ill, after she got on shore. The boatswain lost his wages by the transaction, but that loss he pockets quite heroically. I told him the story of Thomas Garrett, with which he was much pleased. The captain says he has sent the owner of the slave girl *eleven hundred dollars*, to cover his loss. He will, doubtless, lose that amount, if not more, and be looked upon very suspiciously in New Orleans as long as he sails from that port. Had the custom-house officer kept the secret, the poor victim would have been got on shore, and no one would have been the wiser, the boatswain would have saved his wages, and the captain his cash and his character. Now, the losses are all on the right side, but the thirty dollars due the boatswain, and the gains are all as we would wish them. They are trying all sorts of plans to abduct the girl, but she is safe in the hands and the house of our friends the Powells, where she will remain for the present. She is a lively little body, has lived in a French family always, and speaks the language better than ours. I am to give a lecture here this evening, and both she and her deliverer are to be on the platform. I hope to make the occasion one of interest and importance to the cause of humanity. * * * *

March 14.

My lecture last evening went off well. The fugitive and her deliverer were both on the platform, and produced quite a thrilling sensation. I described the circumstances pretty thoroughly of the escape, and told the meeting £100 ($500) are offered for the safe delivery of either of them on board the ship again, and deep-laid plots are tried to secure them. Yesterday, the man entered to go a voyage to the Mediterranean. He signed the initiatory document, and then went away to arrange his chest. Accidentally, while buying some clothes, he was asked in what ship he was to sail. He named her, and said she was bound to the Mediterranean. Some one knew, and told him that ship was loaded for New Orleans!! That accident saved him. He made immediate inquiry, and found it was so, and that the whole was a plot to entrap him, to be carried back to New Orleans.

In my remarks last evening, I took a survey of the character and course of the Republican party, as developed at the Pittsburg Convention. Mr. Channing, in his lecture here some time ago, lauded that party to the skies, and proclaimed it the star of hope to the slave. He put us very low indeed; and many thought and still think us unfaithful to the slave, because we do not join the new banner. With all his hatred of slavery and reputation as "*an abolitionist of the Abolitionists*," I think his course in this country has done the anti-slavery cause but very little real good, if any at all.

"EVANGELICAL CHRISTIANS"?

THE Officers of the American Tract Society refuse to print anything on the duty of teaching servants to read the Word of God, or on the wickedness of separating and desolating Families by the sale of their members, because "Evangelical Christians" at the South will not bear it! In common with multitudes of others who have contributed to the funds controlled by these Officers—who are by turns so timid and so violent—we have asked in amazement, WHO ARE these Evangelical Christians at the South who are so thoroughly and basely subservient to the World that they will not allow the plainest principles of Religion, the very axioms of Morality, to be printed and circulated among them, provided these address *their* consciences, or interfere with their profits? Perhaps the following fact, which we lately received from the lips of a respected and well-known clergyman of the Presbyterian Church, himself born in a slave State, though educated and exercising his ministry at the North, may help us to an answer.

Not many years since, a member of an "Evangelical Church" in one of the northern tier of slave States, at his death left three slaves to as many feeble churches, located in his vicinity; providing, by his will, that the slaves (all of them men) should be "hired out" year by year, and the avails of the labour of each of them be devoted to the "support of the Gospel in one of these churches. For several years after his death, his arrangement was carried out; but at length, the executor of his estate finding that the annual letting of the men was attended with difficulties, and gave rise to certain disagreeable disputes, applied to a lawyer, to ascertain if he could not *sell* the men, under the provisions of the will, and invest the proceeds for the benefit of the same churches. He was advised that he could do so; and, accordingly, these industrious, faithful, and useful workmen were advertised to be sold, at public auction. They were all well known in the vicinity, and highly valued, and the sale naturally drew together a large concourse.

The first man put upon the auction-stand was a skilful and intelligent mechanic, whom many persons were desirous of purchasing, and the competition for whom among the bidders was, therefore, active. Twelve hundred, fourteen, sixteen, eighteen hundred, two thousand dollars were rapidly offered, and still the auctioneer waited for more. At that point, a well-known slavetrader of the neighbourhood struck in with his bid; and the moment his voice was heard, the man who was being sold, who, until then, had borne himself as well as a man might while the last insult to his humanity and to his Maker was being wreaked upon him, broke into an agony of supplication and a torrent of tears. "Master! Master!" he cried, turning to the trader before the assembled crowd, "*don't* you bid on me! DON'T you buy me! I'll serve any man here as well as I can; but *don't* you buy me! I can't go away! I've a wife and five children! I *can't* go south! DON'T you buy me!"

He might as well have talked to an ice-berg to melt it, or to the East wind to stop its blowing. The bids went on higher and higher, till at last he was knocked down—the faithful, industrious and affectionate man—for twenty-six hundred dollars to the remorseless slavetrader. Body and brains, the man, the husband, the father, the Christian—all the more valuable on the auction-block, because of the faculties and the qualities in him that made him dear to the heart of God—was "sold, to go south"; and the proceeds, paid over by the pirate who bought him, were invested *for the support of an Evangelical church!* The terrible anguish of the man, his looks and tones of unutterable despair, so moved the soul of our informant, then a youth, that he hurried from the spot, unable to witness the two similar scenes that were presently to follow. And the emotion with which he rehearsed the scene to us, a few days since, showed that the intervening years had not erased or dimmed his remembrance of it.

Are *these* the "Evangelical Christians" whom the Officers of the Tract Society dare not offend? These men, who sell their brother-believers, because they are poor, to "support the Gospel" for themselves and their children—who make the Family a farce, and build their churches by such horrible co-partnership with the dealers in human souls—are they the ones whose resistance is to stifle the voice of American Christendom on those questions of our times which are a thousand-fold more deep and urgent than any other? Is it the men whose hands are dripping with this bloody sweat, wrung from the anguished souls of those whom God created in his own image, and whom the Saviour died to redeem, whose anticipated remonstrance is more powerful at the Tract House than all the impulses of Humanity and Religion? Fellow-Christians at the North—Fellow-CHRISTIANS at the South, if there are those there, as we believe, to whom such horrible wickedness as this is just as abhorrent as it is to us—shall these things be, without dissent, and be forever? Then there is one inspired utterance of the great and fervent Apostle to the Gentiles, which flashes into the memory like a very bolt of light from the mind of God Himself: "YE CANNOT DRINK THE CUP OF THE LORD, AND THE CUP OF DEVILS"!—*Independent.*

LETTER FROM COL. FREMONT.

From The Boston Atlas.

THE following letter from Col. Fremont to Gov. Charles Robinson, of Kansas, has been handed to us by the Governor himself, with his consent that it should be published:

NEW YORK, Monday, March 17, 1856.
No. 176 Second Avenue.

MY DEAR SIR: Your letter of February reached me in Washington some time since. I read it with much satisfaction. It was a great pleasure to find you retained so lively a recollection of our intercourse in California. But my own experience is, that permanent and valuable friendships are most often formed in contests and struggles. If a man has good points, then they become salient, and we know each other suddenly.

I had both been thinking and speaking of you latterly. The Banks' balloting in the House, and your movements in Kansas, had naturally carried my mind back to our one hundred and forty odd ballots in California, and your letter came seasonably and fitly to complete the connection. We were defeated then, but that contest was only an incident in a great struggle—the victory was deferred, not lost. You have carried to another field the same principle, with courage and ability to maintain, and I make you my sincere congratulations on your success, incomplete so far, but destined in the end to triumph absolutely. I had been waiting to see what shape the Kansas question would take in Congress, that I might be enabled to give you some views in relation to the probable result. Nothing yet has been accomplished, but I am satisfied that in the end Congress will take efficient measures to lay before the American people the exact truths concerning your affairs. Neither you nor I can have any doubt what verdict the people will pronounce upon a truthful exposition. It is to be feared, from the proclamation of the President, that he intends to recognise the usurpation in Congress as the legitimate Government, and that the sedition law, the test oath, and the means taken to expel its people as aliens, will all, directly or indirectly, be supported by the army of the United States. Your position will, undoubtedly, be difficult, but you know I have great confidence in your firmness and prudence. When the critical moment arrives you must act for yourself. No man can give you counsel. A true man will always find his best counsel in that inspiration which a good cause never fails to give him at the instant of trial. All history teaches us that great results are ruled by a wise Providence, and we are but units in the great plan. Your actions will be determined by events as they present themselves; and at this distance I can only say that I sympathize cordially with you, and that, as you stood by me firmly and generously when we were defeated by the nullifiers in California, I have every disposition to stand by you in your battle with them in Kansas.

You see that what I have been saying is more a reply to the suggestions which your condition makes to me than any answer to your letter—which more particularly regards myself. The notices which you had seen of me in connection with the Presidency came from the partial disposition of my friends, who think of me more flatteringly than I do of myself, and do not, therefore, call for any action from us. Repeating that I am really and sincerely gratified in the renewal of our friendship, or rather in the expressions of it, which I hope will not hereafter have so long an interval,

I am yours, very truly, J. C. FREMONT.

Gov. Charles Robinson, Lawrence, Kansas.

A STATE IN CONTUMACY.

IT will be recollected by most of our readers that, about two years ago, an alleged fugitive from slavery was arrested at Milwaukee, in Wisconsin, and was rescued from the custody of the Federal authorities, who cla

when the vessel went down the river, and that at the town of Plymouth the vessel was searched and he was found concealed in the forecastle, and the evidence was exceedingly strong to fix on Woodly the charge of thus concealing him, with a view to his escape to a Northern State. Though ably defended by his counsel, he was found guilty and sentenced to be hung for his offence.

But his counsel did not abandon him. The humanity of our law allows an appeal to the Supreme Court without surety for costs, where a party is unable to give it, and, if there has been any error of law in the trial below, a new trial is allowed.

One of the counsel, Mr. Winston, at some inconvenience and considerable expense to himself, as we have reason to believe, followed the case up, ably argued it in the Supreme Court, and, upon a technical ground, obtained a new trial.

The case was again laid before a jury, as we have already stated, at the late term of Bertie Superior Court—a jury composed of some of the most respectable planters of that County, and the owners in the aggregate, as we are informed, of fully four hundred slaves. The result is an acquittal.

Doubtless the verdict was one of great mercy. The jury may have had a doubt upon some material point—if they had, the prisoner was entitled to the benefit of it, and he received it. We trust it will ever be so in North Carolina, even in the case of a miserable free negro charged with an offence well calculated in these times to excite the indignation of slaveowners. But we think it more than likely that this man's neck was saved from the halter by the very fact that he was a poor ignorant negro. Were one of those worthies who stand at a distance and prompt such men as Woodly to steal our slaves to be placed upon his trial, though we are sure that a North Carolina jury would be as just, we would not confidently say that they would prove so merciful as in this case.

We said that this case was well worthy of notice from that section of country from whence come the bitterest denunciations of our institutions and laws. For instance, they clamour against a law passed to carry out that provision of the Constitution which says fugitives from labour (our slaves) shall be surrendered to their owners. And one of the main points of attack is, that the law disallows a trial by jury in the State where the fugitive may be arrested, though it gives it to him in the State to which he may be remanded. It is said no alleged slave, though free in fact, would ever be able to establish his freedom before a court and jury of slaveholders. Never was there a greater mistake, to call it by no harsher name, than this. We can speak for North Carolina of our own knowledge. The thing has been done here again and again.

The case of Woodly is itself an evidence, and a strong one, of what a North Carolina court and jury would do in all such cases. Were it necessary, we could mention many cases; but we will only, for the present, name one, recently occurring in a County adjoining this. A negro was seized and claimed as a slave by a white person, and placed in jail for safe-keeping, where he remained a few hours only, and was discharged. The negro claimed his freedom as evidenced by a decree made in one of our courts, many years before. But upon examination of the record, no decree appeared to have been made. Such being the case, it was insisted by the claimant that the negro was a slave, and in law was a part of the estate of a former deceased master, through which the claimant derived title. Now, what did the court do under these circumstances? Upon proof that such a decree had been made and ordered to be entered, it caused the record then to be amended so as to speak the truth. The negro sued the party arresting him, and a jury gave him the substantial sum of $750 by way of damages.

We have spoken for North Carolina. We have not the least doubt that the same sense of justice and honour prevails in every other Southern State.

Let us compare, we might say contrast, some of the facts stated by us with what has been done in some of the Northern States.

How many fugitive slaves would be delivered to their owners if they were required to establish their right before a Massachusetts jury? We undertake to say—not one. A jury trial for the slave is wanted there, not that justice may be done, but that it may be defeated; not because they fear, as they pretend, that freemen will be dragged into slavery, but to prevent slaves from being restored to their lawful owners.

In Vermont and Massachusetts the Fugitive Slave law has been virtually nullified by State laws. The last fugitive slave delivered in Boston cost the General Government $30,000, it is said, and the private expenses of the owner were more than the value of the slave.

Since that time, Massachusetts has passed her "Personal Liberty bill," so called, making it highly penal in any of her officers or citizens to aid a Southern man in reclaiming his fugitive slave; and, with a further view of depriving him of all legal assistance, even where he is willing to pay for it, subjecting members of the bar who may appear in his behalf to heavy fines and penalties for so doing; and, to crown all, she has expressly conferred upon jurors the power to judge for themselves of the constitutionality of any law without regard to the opinion of the Court. The owner of a fugitive slave, who there apprehends him, may find himself indicted and sued for false imprisonment before a State court. He sets up as a defence that he has acted under the law of the United States, and under the process of a United States Judge or Commissioner; but the jury before which he is tried, holding, as they certainly will do, the act of Congress to be unconstitutional, he is mulcted in heavy damages, and perhaps sent to the penitentiary. Was there ever such a monstrosity in jurisprudence as this? This, too, in educated, enlightened Massachusetts, in the year of our Lord 1856!

Justice is not so administered in North Carolina. Our juries pronounce upon the facts—they receive the law from our Judges. Our lawyers are allowed to appear for whom they please, and are subjected to no pains and penalties for so doing. Nay, if one is too poor to employ counsel, whether in civil or criminal cases, the courts will assign counsel to him, with whom it is a point of honour faithfully to discharge their duty as such, "without money and without price." In fine, justice and a fair trial are never here denied to any one, even though he should belong to the Underground Railroad Company, and be more than suspected of stealing our negroes.

"EXPUNGING."

In the Ohio Legislature, joint resolutions rescinding the resolutions of censure adopted by the Legislature of Ohio, Feb. 12th, 1842, on John Quincy Adams, for his inflexible advocacy of the right of petition—were recently offered, and will, it is said, doubtless pass both branches. This is well, the best thing that can be done to wipe out the disgrace of those resolutions of '42. Pity they were ever recorded on the legislative records of so goodly a State as Ohio. But they are there, and so they must be, as we understand it, to be read and wondered at by future generations, notwithstanding all that may be now done.

When the famous "expunging resolution" was under discussion in Congress, in 1837, John Q. Adams was asked how the expunging process was to be accomplished; whether the objectionable article was to be erased from the journal with a pen, or the leaf that contained it to be cut out. He replied, "neither, as I understand it. The resolution will remain in the book; black lines will be drawn around it, and across it from right angles, and the word expunged, will be written on the face of it." In confirmation of this opinion he adduced parliamentary precedents. So here the deed of 1842 will stand on the records of Ohio legislation, it will stand on the page of Ohio's history. But let the rescinding resolution pass—let the dark lines be drawn. It will show that in fourteen years the world has moved, and in the right direction—that there has been progress, and that towards sanity and justice.

There is a good deal of this expunging business to be done, and much that men, as well as legislators, would have done, which can never be. The "men of property and standing" of Boston, who broke up a female anti-slavery prayer meeting, and drove non-resistant Garrison through the streets, would like to have that little item expunged from the memories of men and the history of Massachusetts—but it cannot be done. No black lines even "will be drawn around it and across it."

The mob of Concord—who assaulted the house of one of its respectable and peaceable citizens for extending social and Christian hospitality to one George Thompson, an English Abolitionist—would n't like to see their infamy paraded in history. But it is already there. Put there by one of Concord's most honoured citizens. And there it must be, all wishes, all expunging resolutions to the contrary, notwithstanding. Their children, and children's children, will blush and hang their heads over it, but it can't be helped. Facts are eternal, and history is inexorable!

So with that mob at Canaan, that dragged an academy building into the bushes, because a Christian lady dared to admit a class of God's children to the mysteries of letters and science. Whether "men of cloth" actually engaged in this business or not we do not now remember; but we suppose the "vulgar herd" did the ox-work, and the "men of standing" stood by—as a certain gentleman did of ancient times—holding the clothes of them who did the infamous deed. When the history of Canaan shall be written, this shall be written as a testimony against them—and all beyond the hope of "expunging." No redemption, or mitigation, may be looked for by way of "rescinding resolutions." History, in response to all entreaties, will answer, "what I have written, I have written."

These reminiscences are not very agreeable to anybody—but they may afford wholesome warning to some of the present men, should they be at all observant of the tide of events.

Those who sustain pro-slavery men, and pro-slavery parties, and pro-slavery measures, and especially those who, for a kind of decency's sake, refrain from assaulting men's houses and men's persons, yet still attempt to bring their honest neighbours into disrepute and scorn, by ex-ding their best rhetoric on such elegant phrases as and "woolly heads," we say all these men had better look out, God is pressing on the march of events. History is after them, and it, at least, will do them justice, and it will be that very justice that will cause their children to conceal, if possible, their origin!

Could these men some generations hence lift their heads above the earth, and discover that the declaration of independence had found a practical demonstration—that the prayers of God's humble people had been heard—and that the flag of the Union waved not over a solitary slave—it would make their ears tingle, and their pale cheeks crimson, and they would doubtless withdraw to their resting place, finding that of the two the more comfortable.

Let the expunging process go on—but better than all let the occasions for it be diminished—and its necessity brought to an end.—J. F.—*Morning Star.*

THE BLACK OLIGARCHY.

[The National Committee, appointed at the Pittsburg Convention on the 22d of February, in a Circular accompanying their Call for a Republican Presidential Convention, to be held in Philadelphia on the 17th of June next, take occasion to expose the political workings of slavery where it already exists, as seen in the degradation of the non-slaveholding class and the accumulation of power in the hands of the slaveowners. The following extract will be read with interest]

The movement to open the Free Territories to slavery, by repealing the compacts upon the subject, began with the nullifiers of South Carolina. We will begin with that State, to make an exhibition of the sort of government it will enforce in the West, from its results in the South.

Popular sovereignty in South Carolina thus exhibits itself: Six districts in that State, in the rice and long staple cotton region, where the slave population is most dense, containing a population of 49,503 whites, elect a majority of the Senate, leaving in a minority those representing 209,084 whites in the rest of the States. In 11 districts, 77,939 whites elect 28 Senators and 64 Representatives, while 18 districts, 181,145 whites, are represented by 17 Senators and 60 Representatives. Thus less than one-third of the free population in the negro-quarter region have the supreme control of the State. The Legislature elected by this third appoints the Judiciary—from the Supreme Bench to the Common Justices of the Peace; elects Senators to Congress and the electors of President and Vice-President of the United States; for the people are not allowed to vote at all for the electors of President and Vice-President of the United States, this being done by the rotten borough Legislature, in defiance of the spirit of the Constitution and the interpretation of every other State.

The Governor of the State is also elected by this body, which represents a minority of the State—and negroes and land exclusively—for no man is eligible to it unless he has real estate to the value of $7,000, clear of all debt, or five hundred acres of land and ten negroes. Nor can this state of things be changed unless two-thirds of this land and negro qualified body consent to the alteration of the Constitution—a thing never to be expected.

In Virginia and Maryland the system of minority government, to give the control to the slave section over the greater white population in other portions of the State, prevails, but in a less degree; but in all the slave States, whether contrived by constitutional provision or not, the result is that the slaveholding class is sovereign throughout the South.

It results from the concert produced among the masters by their common interest in an institution which can only stand by force of artificial means. The slaves themselves and the non-slaveholders are, as individuals, naturally against it; this makes it necessary that the slaveowners should become a phalanx—an educated, disciplined army, to sustain by political intrigue and united force all attacks upon it. There is no one all-absorbing influence among its enemies to combine adversaries in opposition. The consequence is that the 347,000 masters, forever animated by the same instinct, can always vanquish partial and desultory opposition, as standing armies in absolute Governments keep millions of people in subjugation. The monopoly which nearly 4,000,000 of black men give to the united authority which commands them, makes it impossible that any single-handed competitor in the field of labour can, in cultivating the products of the soil, enter the market with the staples of the South on equal footing with men who wield the force of ten, twenty and thirty, and hundreds of slaves in companies. The owners of slaves command the markets; they put down individual competitors; they buy out the little plantations which in the earlier settlements surround them, and, in the end, the rich lands all become the domains of rich planters. Hence we see in the older Southern States the poorer classes are either tenants at will, or, banished to the poor land of the hills, take to the life of idlers, hunters or fishermen; or, at best, the more industrious among them become day-labourers, living from hand to mouth; in a word, they are stripped by the oligarchy of slaveowners, who command their wages, their tenements, and, of course, everything. The class who hold a monopoly of the soil can command everything. "He takes my life who takes the means whereby I live." Hence, in the South, the monopolists of the land and black labour of the country, although numbering but 347,000 out of a population of 6,000,000, in virtue of their power over near four millions of slaves, are absolute in the State Governments. They are the Governors, the Legislators, the Judges, Justices, Sheriffs; they are all in all.

The power which combined action gives to the slaveholding class over the whole South is wielded with equal effect to obtain control over the North. The machine it moves there is on a large scale, and the instrumentality of its action visible to the least discerning eye. Every Northern aspirant for the Presidency may be looked upon as a power in the hand of the South, to move the machine of the Federal Government according to its will. We instance the experiment before our eyes. Mr. Pierce is a candidate for reelection to the Presidency; Mr. Douglas, Mr. Cass, Mr. Buchanan, are hopeful rivals; each have their partisans in the different sections of the North; some forty or fifty thousand office-holders and dependants on executive favour rely upon one or the other of these to make them secure in their posts. It is known to all these people that not one of the rivals can command a majority of the Northern vote against the other; nor, indeed, against an opponent of any other party. For either of them, the vote of the South decides the question of nomination; and then the possibility of election depends absolutely upon a united Southern support. The Southern slaveholders, therefore, have the fate of all these seekers of the Presidency, of the so-called Democratic party, entirely in their hands.

And here we find in what consists that which is now vaunted to be the Democratic party *par excellence*. It is composed of the office-holders under the present Administration, headed by those chiefs who are looked to to continue them in office, through the united vote of the South, and the chance vote of some Northern State, obtained by plurality—the result of the division of their opponents, growing out of personal preferences or party dissensions. The Democratic party which the Administration calls its own, has no basis but the oligarchy of the South—we might call it the BLACK OLIGARCHY, returning to it the appellation which it is so willing to give to others, because it most appropiately belongs to itself. The leaders of this party in the North have proved themselves entirely worthy of its confidence by abandoning every principle of democracy once their boast. They have abandoned the principles of the fathers of the Republic, who considered it as the first attribute of the new order of things established by the Revolution, that it would arrest the spread of slavery throughout the continent. It did lead to its immediate extinction in many of the State, and the first act under the Constitution was to exclude it from the whole territory of the Union. The Democratic leaders of the new order, at the bidding of the Southern nullifiers, have broken all the compacts and compromises designed to establish Free Republics in the territories from which slavery was excluded. In doing this they have put under foot the representative principle; defied the will of their immediate constituents; on receiving instructions to repeal their acts have refused to obey; and in this have given the most striking example of an utter abandonment of the cardinal doctrine of democracy. The spread of liberty, not slavery, is its distinctive principle.

They have shown that the will of 347,000 slaveowners in the South is more to them than that of twenty millions of freemen in the North. The leaders of this spurious Democracy are but the satraps of Southern masters.

The fate which awaits a people afflicted with a Democracy which grows up under the government of slaveowners, may be seen in the testimony which we give in the words of the most distinguished men of that party, which we find collated in a pamphlet by Mr. Weston.

Mr. Sarver, of Missouri, in a paper on "Domestic Manufactures in the South and West," published in 1847, says:

"The free population of the South may be divided into two classes—the slaveholder and the non-slaveholder." I am not aware that the relative numbers of these two classes have ever been ascertained in any of the States, but I am satisfied that the non-slaveholders far outnumber the slaveholders—perhaps by three to one. In the more southern portion of this region the non-slaveholders possess, generally, but very small means, and the land which they possess is almost universally poor, and so sterile that a scanty subsistence is all that can be derived from its cultivation; and the more fertile soil, being in the possession of the slaveholder, must ever remain out of the power of those who have none.

"This state of things is a great drawback, and bears heavily upon and depresses the moral energies of the poorer classes. * * * The acquisition of a respectable position in the scale of wealth appears so difficult, that they decline the hopeless pursuit, and many of them settle down into habits of idleness, and become the almost passive subjects of all its consequences. And I lament to say that I have observed of late years that an evident deterioration is taking place in this part of the population, the younger portion of it being less educated, less industrious, and, in every point of view, less respectable than their ancestors."

In the January number, 1850, of *De Bow's Review*, in an article on "Manufactures in South Carolina," we have an exhibition of the fears entertained of bringing together masses of non-slaveholding Southern white population even for manufacturing purposes:

"So long as these poor but industrious people could see no mode of living except by a degrading operation of work with the negro upon the plantation, they were content to endure life in its most discouraging forms, satisfied that they were above the slave, though faring often worse than he. But the progress of the world is 'onward,' and though in some sections it is slow, still it is 'onward,' and the great mass of our poor white population begin to understand that they have rights, and that they, too, are entitled to some of the sympathy which falls upon the suffering. They are fast learning that there is almost an infinite world of industry opening before them, by which they can elevate themselves and their families from wretchedness and ignorance, to competence and intelligence. *It is this great upheaving of our masses that we have to fear, so far as our institutions are concerned.*"

* * * * * * * * * *

And this, taken in connection with the condition of the poor white population in the South—as shown in the passages we have taken from the address of Gov. Hammond, of South Carolina, the Hon. C. C. Clay, of Alabama, and other leading Southern statesmen—explains the recent article in *The Richmond Enquirer*, the oracle of Southern interests, which elaborately argues the right of subjecting whites, as well as blacks, to slavery. Nay, it goes so far as to insist that this right of making white slaves is "inalienable." The article thus presses this point:

"They (those holding Mr. Jefferson's doctrine) begin to reason, by assuming slavery to be morally and religiously wrong; and the South hitherto has granted their premises, and attempted to justify negro slavery as an exception to a general rule, or, if wrong, as a matter of bargain between the North and the South. *The laws of God and nature are immutable, and man cannot bargain them away.* While it is far more obvious that negroes should be slaves than whites—for they are only fit to labour, not to direct—*yet the principle of slavery is itself right, and does not depend on difference of complexion.*"

Under this doctrine it follows that here a more direct enslavement of the white race may be insisted upon than that obtained in Mexico under the contrivance of debtor vassalage. The doctrine is a positive sanction to the bondage of the white race, and asserts that "the laws of God and nature are immutable" in its support, "and man cannot bargain them away." It is practically illustrated now in the Utah Territory, where a man holds a multitude of women as slaves, calling them his wives. What is there in Mr. Ritchie's principle to prevent Brigham Young from holding ninety white men as slaves under bills of sale, as well as ninety white women under pretense of the bonds of matrimony?

Mr. Ritchie's explanation of the Southern doctrine of slavery, together with Mr. Douglas's act for the Territories, which "leaves the people perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States," certainly authorizes the Mormon States to come into the Union with the Turkish system full blown, which makes slaves of all colours, and wives without number. It is a sad commentary on our progress, that at the moment when the news arrives of the Sultan's firman putting an end to the traffic in slaves in his Empire—of the Czar's steps for the liberation of the serfs in Russia, and of their actual enfranchisement in the Danubian Principalities—we should have negro slavery forced on one Territory by an usurpation set up by the sword, and the right of the Mormons recognised in another to hold a multitude of the gentler sex in servitude, under the unnatural law of a plurality of wives!

We hold that Congress is bound by the Constitution "to make all needful rules and regulations for the Territories of the United States," and, during their pupilage and preparation to become members of the Confederacy, to prevent the growth within them of systems incongruous with the pure and free, the just and safe principles inaugurated by the Revolution.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

WITHOUT CONCEALMENT—WITHOUT COMPROMISE.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, APRIL 19, 1856.

TWENTY-THIRD ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY!

The Twenty-Third Public Anniversary of the American Anti-Slavery Society will be held at the CITY ASSEMBLY ROOMS (No. 446 Broadway, between Howard and Grand sts.), in the City of New York, on WEDNESDAY, May 7th, at 10 o'clock A. M., and will be continued at the same place during the remainder of the day, and on THURSDAY, 8th. Addresses are expected from WM. LLOYD GARRISON, WENDELL PHILLIPS, Rev. THEODORE PARKER, Mrs. LUCY STONE BLACKWELL, of Cincinnati, Rev. SAMUEL J. MAY, of Syracuse, CHARLES L. REMOND, and others to be hereafter announced.

As full an attendance of the members and friends of the Society as practicable, from all parts of the country, is earnestly desired and strongly urged.

We reiterate our former declaration, that the object of the Society is not *merely* to make "Liberty national and Slavery sectional"—nor to prevent the acquisition of Cuba—nor to restore the Missouri Compromise—nor to repeal the Fugitive Slave bill—nor to make Kansas a free State—nor to resist the admission of any new slave State into the Union—nor to terminate slavery in the District of Columbia and in the National Territories—but it is, primarily, comprehensively, and uncompromisingly, to effect the immediate, total and eternal overthrow of Slavery, wherever it exists on American soil, and to expose and confront whatever party or sect seeks to purchase peace or success at the expense of human liberty. Living or dying, our motto is "NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS, RELIGIOUSLY OR POLITICALLY!"

In behalf of the Executive Committee,

WM. LLOYD GARRISON, President.

EDMUND QUINCY, S. H. GAY, } Secretaries.

☞ RHODE ISLAND ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION.—A Convention of all persons in the State of Rhode Island opposed to Slavery and in favour of its Immediate and Unconditional Abolition—and to that end the friends of a thorough and persistent Agitation against its multiform cruelties, incessant encroachments, and daring usurpations—will be held in Westminster Hall (Westminster st.), in the City of PROVIDENCE, commencing on SATURDAY morning, April 26th, at 10 o'clock, A.M., continuing through day and evening, and also through SUNDAY, 27th, day and evening.

WM. LLOYD GARRISON, WENDELL PHILLIPS, STEPHEN S. FOSTER, WM. WELLS BROWN, SAMUEL MAY, JR., and other speakers, will be present.

THE BLIND THAT WON'T SEE.

Hear the word of the Lord spoken by the Hebrew prophet Isaiah: "For precept must be upon precept, precept upon precept; line upon line, line upon line; here a little, and there a little."

Is this tautology, a *vain* repetition? By no means! It is a true declaration of what was in the beginning, is now, and ever must be the mode of dealing with human beings, men and women as well as children, to whom you would teach anything; namely, a patient repetition, over and over and over and over, of the things which *you* see to be indispensable to their welfare, but which they continue to disregard and forget.

And thereto agrees that which was spoken by the English prophet William, surnamed Shakspeare, "He that will have a cake out of the wheat must tarry the grinding, bolting, leavening, kneading and baking: nay, also the cooling, if he would not burn his fingers."

The experience of Abolitionists is full of evidence of this. It is of no use to complain of it or fret about it; we must recognise it as a part of God's system, adapt ourselves to it, and frame our course of action in harmony with it. The false teaching which a man has had drilled into him with assiduous labour twice a week through a whole life is not to be reversed, and annulled by a single statement of the truth. The left hand has as many flexors and extensors as the right; but it cannot write a letter, cannot draw a check, cannot even sign that which shall be recognised as the owner's name. To teach it all these things will require a long process of instruction, with many wearisome repetitions. And it will take a still longer time to unlearn the art in which the muscles have been trained to a vicious mode of action by these instructions and repetitions. Thus, when a man has been all his life learning error by direct instruction, when he has confirmed his way of thinking, and speaking, and acting to it, when he has by contact absorbed and assimilated it all his life, to replace this by truth, and make this truth equally operative as a spring of action, *must* require time, patience and repetition. No other way is possible with ordinary minds. We must keep repeating until the matter in question has gained a lodgment, first in the ear, and then in the attention, and then in the understanding, and then in the conscience, and then in the life.

We find the following paragraph among items under the head "Moral and Religious" in *The Tribune:*

CHRISTIAN INSTRUCTION OF SLAVES.—The Rev. Dr. Jones, a distinguished Presbyterian minister of Georgia, is earnestly advocating the education of slave children in the Sabbath schools. He thinks it may be safe to introduce them into the same schools with white children, if placed in another part of the room, and is very confident that religious instruction will make them more useful and reliable as servants. He urges, what has been unavailingly urged a thousand times, that if the slaves of the South perish eternally for want of Christian knowledge, upon their owners will the heavy guilt rest. But, does Dr. Jones, or anybody else, believe that there is such a God in Heaven as would, under any circumstances, add to the wrongs and crimes perpetrated against this down trodden race in this world an eternity of suffering in *another* world?

To the concluding question of this paragraph we reply, Yes, *yes*, YES, YES. Does *anybody* believe it? The *majority*, an overwhelming majority of all the men and women in the United States believe it. Nor is this strange, when an overwhelming majority of those who are educated, licensed, ordained, installed, accepted, paid, and continued from year to year as the religious teachers and guides of the people teach that very thing, and worse, as an essential part of true religion. If, from a belief that church membership in the United States is either a duty or a privilege, you apply for it, you will find in nineteen churches out of every twenty, in every one of these States, that you cannot be recognised nor received as a Christian without explicit assent to a dogma including that respecting which the paragraph above cited asks, "Does *anybody* believe it?" The facts in the case would be more nearly expressed by the question, Does not everybody believe it?

It is obvious—to all who do not refuse to look at the evidence—that the American Church is *the* bulwark of slavery. The clergy, its leaders, do not oppose slavery, do oppose the persons who are most vigorously fighting against it, and do fraternize with slaveholders and their apologists as with Christians. Even in a case so extreme as that of Henry Ward Beecher, who really dislikes slavery, and *actually opposes* its extension beyond its present limits, the *esprit du corps* holds so strongly that he silently allows his influence to support the grossest calumny against Abolitionists, and, though quite ready to controvert Drs. Adams, Blagden, Lord and Winslow in their defence of slavery from the Bible, as soon as the question comes up of their regenerate state, of their being children of God and heirs of heaven, of their fitness to join in the communion of saints below and the assembly of the just made perfect above, he gives them his voice, vote, influence, letter of recommendation, and certificate of *good* as well as regular standing. His clerical position implies, *of course*, his authentication and support of his clerical brethren.

But, in a case which, though included in the domain of religion, belongs quite as much to the departments of business and politics, where men still claim the right, and to some extent actually use the freedom, of thinking for themselves—and in a matter so obviously contrary both to the Christianity and the republicanism in which this nation has "a name to live"—how do the clergy succeed in persuading men that slavery is right? how do they even succeed in making out a *prima facie* case in favour of it?

Even the readiness of men to accept, without a very critical examination, an argument which represents their duty as identical with their supposed interest, does not go to the bottom of this matter, or fully explain it. For an explanation which shall be both just and adequate, we must recognise another fact, namely:

The propositions comprised in a defence of slavery, as conformable to the purpose and will of God, are either directly or potentially included in another, which the clergy have long ago persuaded the people to accept as a fixed and settled element in their religious system, and which thus stands, with the same force that a self-evident proposition would have (as far as the followers of the clergy are concerned), to bar all progress or investigation in that direction.

Here the subscribers to THE STANDARD must pardon us if we occupy a paragraph of their time and space by a piece of charitable circumlocution needed only by the *borrowers* of it.

When we censure Dr. South-side Adams for his suggestion that it might be well to legalize and extend the African slave trade, we do not for a moment suppose, nor wish our readers to suppose, that he approves, or is pleased with, the method of the men who carry on this sort of business. He does not like the building, fitting out and storing of a vessel with complete disregard of all other considerations than that of bringing a certain number of "niggers" from their native country, and landing them *alive* at Savannah or any other place where they begin to have a mercantile value to their captors: he does not like the firing of an African village in the dead of night, the killing of so many of its inhabitants as will insure the capture of the rest, the compulsory embarcation of those who are considered worth taking, the packing them, entirely naked, as closely as they can lie between decks, with their faces all in one direction, and the use of the whip to compel them to eat beans enough to prolong such a life: he does not like the large percentage "lost" by disease and death under the most favourable circumstances, nor the painful "necessity" of throwing them overboard in irons on the approach of a cruiser, nor the further loss of life in the acclimation of those who are *safely* landed, nor the harshness of *some* of the overseers in exacting their labour. All these circumstances, and perhaps some others, are unpleasant and unsatisfactory. But what counterbalancing circumstance renders the system thus commenced satisfactory *on the whole?*

It is this: The country in which these miserable blacks were born and lived is a heathen country. That to which they are thus unceremoniously and involuntarily transferred is a Christian country. All who, reaching this country alive, lived long enough to learn the language, and were fortunate enough to be on a plantation where the Gospel was preached, thus attained *a chance* of salvation; and those among them and their posterity who accepted this offer, and fulfilled the prescribed conditions, were actually rescued from hell, and insured the enjoyment of everlasting happiness. Thus, if from the whole number of coloured people whose history has been modified by the interposition of slavehunters, slavetraders, and slaveholders, we deduct those who were killed at the onslaught in Africa, those who were killed directly and indirectly on the middle passage, those who died after their arrival and before they heard the Gospel preached, and, lastly, those who, after hearing, did not accept and fulfil the offered conditions, a certain percentage remains who are SAVED; and since the salvation of a single soul is worth more than ten thousand worlds, and of course counterbalances any conceivable amount of merely temporal suffering and adversity, the result is on the whole satisfactory, even if we stop here; but if we consider further that some of these Christianized Africans, being emancipated by their kind masters after getting past the period of profitable labour, will be sent to Liberia by the Colonization Society, and thus have an opportunity to preach the Gospel in that benighted country, and indefinitely extend the chance of salvation *there*, the prospect widens—the percentage of gain from the whole transaction increases—the moral wilderness proceeds to bud and blossom like the rose—and the enterprise which, to the eye of carnal reason, seemed so inauspiciously begun by the fitting out of a slavetrader, proves to have been a "great Providential arrangement," bringing forth fruit a hundred fold to the glory of God.

But stop a moment! For it behooves us to look carefully enough into this matter to be sure that it is indeed the glory of God, and not of the Devil, that we are celebrating. Does not all this theory imply that the unfortunate Africans who, waked in the night by the blaze of their palm-leaf huts, rushed out to defend their wives and children, and were shot or stabbed by their assailants—that those who perished on the slave-ship by dysentery, or suffocation, or gangrened wounds, or direct violence, or who, losing their eyes by ophthalmia, and thus becoming useless, were thrown overboard, or who were thrown overboard by hundreds, in perfect health, to save the necks of their kidnappers from the summary justice of a British frigate—and, finally, that those who died after their landing in a "Christian country" without having learned the language, or without having heard or read the Gospel—are all inevitably and eternally *damned?* Can the small percentage of salvation claimed by Parson Jones of Georgia and Parson Adams of Boston to be secured to the Africans by slavery, at such hideous cost of blood, and brutality, and suffering, be reckoned a gain *at all* except on the awful supposition that they would ALL have been damned unless the slaver had gone to Africa, and that the God whose glory is assumed to be augmented by so saving such a proportion of them had otherwise determined, and actually made preparation, to broil each and every one of them alive, to all eternity?

Amazing, utterly amazing as it is in a country called Christian, and enlightened, the great body of the clergy actually teach this, and the great body of the people believe it. The immense operations of the Bible, Tract, Sunday School, Home Missionary and Foreign Missionary Societies are founded on just this idea, and the people pay the enormous sums necessary to carry them on because they believe in this representation. Even the New England people, much as they love money, and sharply as they look after their money's worth, not only pay their money to send this doctrine to others, but bestow both money and time to get it preached to themselves. They retain in their service and liberally support the men who teach this dreadful libel upon the character of God; give them the highest seats in the synagogues and the chief rooms at feasts; give them diplomas with the title of Rabbi; intrust to them, very largely, the education of their children; give up one of the seven days of the week, at their dictation, to spiritual perversion, instead of spiritual improvement; go Sunday after Sunday through their whole lives to hear their inculcation of the duty of believing in two invisible spiritual powers, one of whom, if he were able, would damn the whole of them, while the other, being able, will actually damn the greater part of them; and sit patiently under the insult of hearing this system called the Gospel, and being told that the word Gospel means *good news.*

Let no man accuse us of wandering, in this representation, out of our appropriate sphere of Anti-Slavery. It is precisely because the clergy have previously established these monstrous caricatures of the Universal Father as truths in the minds of men that they are able to succeed in the further enormity of representing Him as the inventor and patron of slavery; precisely because they have persuaded the people that oppression and injustice are to be practised by God himself, throughout eternity, that they can impart plausibility to their official license, their "indulgence" to men to practise them on earth. Our business is to disentangle their web of mingled truth and falsehood; and to show how—though it be true; and a glorious and delightful truth, that God's system is the right one and the best one for man—this does not authenticate what the priests of *false* systems of religion—such as the Hindoo, Chinese and American—say of the character, or commands, or permissions of their distorted and abominable idols. The God whom Christ revealed, the God who *is* love, who loves men, and who gave them love as their rule of action with each other does not approve or permit slaveholding, however thoroughly Parson Adams's God may do so.

THE AMERICAN TRACT SOCIETY DENOUNCING ANTI-SLAVERY AGITATION.

This Society, when asked to rebuke American slavery, solemnly avers that it is restrained by its Constitution from publishing anything not "calculated to receive the approbation of all evangelical Christians." It seems, however, utterly unconscious of any constitutional restraint when rebuking such Christians for dancing, smoking, &c. It has lately taken the liberty, notwithstanding the Constitution, of making an indirect, but very malignant, charge against the vast multitude of evangelical Christians engaged in exposing the exceeding wickedness and injurious consequences of American slavery. Dr. Adams, the pro-slavery censor of the Tract press, had already rebuked these Christians, and called on them to repent of their evil ways, but he did not accuse them of infidelity. Our democrats and doughfaces are perpetually denouncing the anti-slavery agitation as treasonable, and as tending to the destruction of the Union, for it is by this craft that they get their offices, yet even they have not the effrontery to call it infidel; on the contrary, with them it is *fanaticism.* But what says the American Tract Society on the subject? In the leading editorial of the *American Messenger* for February last, the editor gives an account of some of the feats of infidelity. He tells us, "Infidelity begat 'red republicanism,' and redder 'socialism,' on the continent. Infidelity imported the principles which strike at the root of social order, domestic purity and national security. Infidelity fans the flame of sectional jealousy and hate."

Here we have the doings of infidelity in Europe and America. The reader is at liberty to understand the principles *imported* by infidelity, and which are dangerous to social order and national security, to be anti-slavery or not, as he pleases; but as to the last occupation ascribed to infidelity there can be no doubt. The only question which, at the present day, can possibly be said to excite *sectional* jealousy and hate is the slavery question, and this is the flame which the American Tract Society declares is fanned by infidelity!! If it be true that infidelity is raising its voice against the iniquities and abominations of American bondage, it has in fact become more Christian than cotton divinity, which insults the Almighty, revokes his precepts, and degrades his Holy Word by making it the warrant for the foulest injustice, the vilest cruelty.

The Tract Society well knows, and will yet have bitter experience, that the anti-slavery agitation is the fruit of deep Christian feeling, and that men of pure faith and holy lives are engaged in it. Yet, in language too plain to be mistaken, the *American Messenger* intimates that this agitation is the work of infidelity!! Yes, thousands and thousands of evangelical Christians are thus vilely slandered by a Society, or rather its Publishing Committee, who, with solemn face, assure the world that they cannot, with a good conscience, publish anything not calculated to meet the approbation of ALL evangelical Christians!! How long will evangelical Christians support a religious press under the censorship of NEHEMIAH ADAMS?

ANTI-SLAVERY IN KENTUCKY.

The Newport (Ky.) *News* brings us a report of a mass meeting held at Madison, the County seat of Madison Co., Ky., a few days since, for the purpose of appointing delegates to the National Republican Nominating Convention and organizing a County Republican Association. The meeting was held in the Court-House and was numerously attended. William Stepp, Esq., was chosen to preside. Cassius M. Clay offered a Constitution for a Republican Association on the basis of the Pittsburg Platform, and containing the following article:

"This Society disclaims any right to interfere, except by moral influence, with slavery in the local sovereignties of South Carolina, or Mississippi, or Missouri, or any other State, North or South; but avows the right and intention of using all political and moral means for the overthrow of slavery in Kentucky and the Union—which the Constitution of Kentucky and the United States—to which we owe allegiance—allow us."

William Stepp was elected President, and Rev. John G. Fee Corresponding Secretary of the Association. Resolutions were adopted in accordance with the principles set forth in the Constitution. Cassius M. Clay, after the business had thus far progressed, made a long speech, which was listened to with the closest attention. The Rev. J. G. Fee was then called upon for a speech, but he declined. Then the Rev. Mr. Johns of the Methodist Episcopal Church made a pro-slavery speech. According to the report of *The News*, when it appeared that he was opposed to the Republicans, he was not allowed to proceed until Clay interposed. *The News* reporter says:

"He made a very elaborate defence of the American party against the assaults of Mr. Clay, and, among other denunciations of Republicanism, boasted of the mob by which Mr. Brady was driven from Lexington. The highest excitement prevailed, amid 'That's right; pitch into them,' by Johns's friends, and the suppressed murmurs of his opponents.

"When he closed, Mr. Clay arose and pressed the reverend gentleman so closely upon the avowal of mob law that he disavowed any indorsement of that act, but said he merely mentioned the facts."

The Rev. Mr. Fee then took his brother Johns in hand and seated him. While this was in progress, another preacher handed Johns a copy of *The New York Herald*, in which Clay was denounced for being compelled, through his assignee, to sell his life estate in trust slaves, and Johns read it. Great excitement followed. All parties sprang to their feet. The report of Clay's remarks, given by *The News*, and the conclusion of business by the meeting, we quote:

"Mr. Clay calmly rose. He regretted that gentlemen had felt compelled to show so little magnanimity as to allude to his personal misfortunes. He considered it a poor cause which descended from reason and facts to personal insinuation. This people knew him. Such arguments might be used in Charleston or New Orleans, but not here! Not by pecuniary interests, certainly, was he influenced. His father, next to R. Wickliffe, had been the largest slaveholder in Kentucky; his interests were on that side. Not by political election, certainly. He had beaten all his political opponents, both in that and the Fayette district. The road to fame and office was open to him. When he returned from the Mexican war, he was asked to give up his opposition to slavery, and he was told no post in the nation was too high for him. Now, after he had sacrificed ALL in this cause—time, and money, and family, and friends, and fame, almost life itself—here, in his own home, these ungenerous taunts were brought against him. He had liberated all the slaves he held in his own right. Had he carried those trust slaves to Ohio and liberated them, he would have violated the right of his heirs and been denounced as a violator of law and a 'negro thief.' Now, since his misfortunes had caused them to be sold by assignees, he was calumniated for the efficacy of laws which he had so much struggled to overthrow, and which his accusers had, against his will, kept upon the statute book.

"Here the sympathy and indignation of the crowd seemed so great that even Mr. Johns shrunk under it. He arose and said he did not intend to cast any imput

supreme law of Ohio. Our jails and officers and "all good citizens" are by it placed at the service of slavehunters, and our Legislature has never moved in the matter, nor has a Governor ever recommended any action in his message. Especially is that inaction dishonourable, since the acknowledged unconstitutionality of the tyrannical and wicked requirements of the law of 1850, which jeopards the liberty of every citizen who has not a light complexion for his defence."

MR. GIDDINGS AMONG THE PROGRESSIVE FRIENDS.

To the Editors of The Anti-Slavery Standard.

On the 6th instant, the Hon. J. R. Giddings attended the First day meeting of Progressive Friends, in the new meeting-house at Longwood, in Chester Co., Pa. During the services of the meeting, to use his own language, he felt "moved to speak." The seven brief articles of our association being read, he took occasion to express his sympathy with this religious body and the character of its platform. Had he been for years accustomed to preaching the gospel of peace, instead of wearing the *warrior's* mail at his post as the sentinel of freedom in the National Councils, he could not have spoken with greater unction, or evinced a deeper knowledge of spiritual things and the beautiful harmony between religion and life. He also spoke with great earnestness of the guilty connection of the popular Church with slavery. In the afternoon, by appointment, he addressed our people on the present aspects of the Government in relation to slavery. The house was crowded, and he was certainly in his happiest mood. His organ of hope stood up like a great pillar of strength. He is admirably calculated to inspire hope and confidence in those who hear him. His audience were delighted with the rich fund of anecdote in which he indulged, as he revealed many incidents which occurred among the political wire-workers, behind the screen. Then his trust in the divinity and omnipotence of Truth is calculated to impress the wavering in a most remarkable manner.

It seems to be a law of Divine Providence, that when a strong man is removed his mantle falls on another, and the wheels of reformation go on with unchecked power; but I would have the citizens of Ashtabula, at this critical juncture of affairs in the government, to consider well whether it will be wise in them to permit this long-tried and faithful sentinel to leave his post, when his judgment, wisdom and sagacity are so much needed? This question is often asked in Pennsylvania. Will the people of Ohio answer as wise men?

With very kind regard, JOSEPH A. DUGDALE.

From The Kennett Square Free Press, April 8th.

There is something perfectly invincible in the power of genuine integrity, of real honesty of purpose, of a strict adherence to that, which, in the eyes of all men, is manifestly just and true. Great and God-like as is the human intellect, wonderful and numberless as are its mighty powers, yet the highest finish, the divinest element in the whole nature of man is simple honesty, true sincerity, an earnest, plain, direct support of the Right under all circumstances, in small things and in great.

The truth of this view is strongly illustrated by the life and labours of the Hon. Joshua R. Giddings, who, by a recent visit, has reanimated all the lovers of liberty in this section. On Sunday last he gave two discourses in the meeting-house of the Progressive Friends at Longwood. Not having been present at the morning meeting, we can only give the testimony of others that he gave them a beautiful address, but we have rarely listened to one more intensely interesting than that of the afternoon. The graphic picture which he gave of the nine weeks' struggle for the election of Speaker at the opening of the present session of Congress was of unusual interest. Much as has been written and read upon the matter, there was a new charm, a peculiar effect in this verbal relation, not only because of the charm which verbal relations only can give, the magic which the human voice and "face divine" alone can give to words, but because it was a raising of the curtain which brought to view the actors behind the scene as well as on the stage, and by one of the leaders in the contest, a leader foremost and faithful in the defence of Republican principles and just government. The finishing strokes of the picture, the final passage of the vote, the administering of the oath to the Speaker, the shouts of applause which told much for the prospects of freedom, his own share in this proud triumph in a conflict in which he had fought side by side with John Quincy Adams, Slade, &c., all must have fixed an impression upon the mind of every listener that will long remain.

Amid the many political delinquencies of Pennsylvania and Chester County, and we regret we must confess they are many, he had one word of high commendation for Chester County's present representative which was received with gratified applause by the audience; and it is to be hoped most earnestly that in the future there may be more such noble needs of which we may be proud. Mr. Giddings expressed the sincere wish of every patriotic Pennsylvanian when he hoped that the land of Penn might be aroused to a consciousness of its duties and its power in the great question of human liberty.

Mr. GIDDINGS took the opportunity afforded by his absence from Washington, in pursuance of the engagement at Longwood, to visit Norristown also. The *Herald and Free Press* of that place, says:

"The Hon. Joshua R. Giddings, of Ohio, was with us on Friday evening last, and delivered a very able and feeling address on Slavery and Republicanism. The venerable member opened by saying that 'the present National Administration had forced upon this country, the issue of slavery or no slavery in Kansas, and the other Territories and States hitherto consecrated to Freedom'; and he called upon all who were willing to accept the challenge and take issue with Gen. Pierce, Douglas and party, on this question, to unite in one solid phalanx, irrespective of party names, and opinions on other subjects, to repel these merciless and ruthless invaders of human rights, and save our fair land from the oppressor's wrong. He spoke of the Union of the anti-slavery mind in Ohio, and the results of that united action. Pennsylvania could do the same thing, and he was happy to see that she had taken one step toward that noble end.

"He spoke nearly two hours to a large audience, and was listened to with a great deal of interest and attention; laying aside all wild and Utopian projects, his suggestions are eminently practical, and do great credit to his head and heart."

The *Olive Branch* says:

"We never heard Mr. Giddings do better. His position was at once ultra and conciliating, but his blows upon the monster slavery were struck like the blows of Thor, heavy and stunning. Mr. Giddings is about to retire to private life, and expects to spend the remainder of his vigour in writing or speaking. May he long live to see the blessings which have attended his manly efforts in the Halls of Congress, in behalf of Freedom."

THE CINCINNATI SLAVE CASE.—The Cincinnati *Gazette* of the 12th inst., has the following paragraph, from which it will be seen that Margaret Garner, after having been brought back to Kentucky for the ostensible purpose of being sent to Ohio to be tried for murdering her child, was taken out of the Covington jail by a trick of Gaines or some of his supporters and placed beyond the reach of Gov. Chase's requisition:

"It will be recollected that Mr. Gaines announced some time ago, in a statement which was republished in *The Gazette*, that he had sent Marshal Butts after Margaret, and would surrender her to the requisition of Gov. Chase, as soon as she could be brought back. Butts returned with her a week ago yesterday, having travelled the last part of the route with Gov. Morehead, who said he would telegraph her arrival to Gov. Chase as soon as he reached Frankfort. Margaret was placed by Gaines in Covington jail to await a requisition. On Wednesday, Mr. Cox, the Prosecuting-Attorney, received the necessary papers from Gov. Chase, and the next day (Thursday), two of the Sheriff's deputies went over to Covington for Margaret, but did not find her, as she had been taken away from the jail the night before. The Jailor said he had given her up on Wednesday night, to a man who came there with a written order from her master, Gaines, but could not tell where she had been taken. The officers came back and made a return 'not found.'"

A letter in *The Tribune*, dated at Cincinnati April 11th, says:

"Mr. H. H. Robinson has not yet returned from Washington, where he went to get his pay for 'doing more than his duty.' As he went for money and has not returned, I suppose the object of his mission is not accomplished.

"From some things I have heard lately I am convinced that not one-half of the atrocity of the late slave case in this city has been made public; but murder will out, and the story cannot be kept secret much longer, and when the history of the whole case is completed, the public, if it has any sense of honour or justice left, will demand a different slave law, if we must have any, and a different set of men to execute it."

DR. J. S. ROCK (says a writer in *The Liberator* of last week) gave a very interesting lecture on the Unity and Equality of the Race, on Friday evening last, at the Hall of the House of Representatives. Senator Taft, of Worcester County, presided, and a large audience listened with attention and interest to the speaker's ingenious and well-expressed argument. The lecture manifested thorough investigation and study of the subject, and great familiarity with the different writers upon it. Dr. Rock spoke about an hour and a quarter, with scarcely any reference to his notes, with entire self-possession, in a very pleasing manner, and in a clear, distinct, and agreeable voice. He speaks well. It seemed to us that, in the treatment of some portions of his subject, he was perhaps the advocate of one side of the question, more than the impartial judge of the merits of the whole; also, that he allowed too little for the influences of climate upon different nations and branches of the great human family. His main point, however, was ably argued, and we think he established fully the doctrine of the essential Unity of the Human Race. This lecture is far better worth frequent repeating than many of those which are received with favour by our lyceums.

From our Boston Correspondent.

NO. CLXXXVII.

THE ARGUMENT.—The Correspondent on the Recreation of Fasting—He philosophizeth and generalizeth—He hath a turn of the Paranomasiasis—But soon recovereth himself—He indulgeth in reminiscence—And telleth of the happy days of youth—He compareth the Former Days with these and findeth them not so good.—He suggesteth a new Chair for a neglected Science—Of the Minister's Saturnalia—Its uses—Theodore Parker's Discourse of Rifles—The Correspondent lamenteth the state of Religion—He recurreth to the Dorchester Schism—And telleth of the War of Religion there—He lamenteth the result, yet rejoiceth in the way some Battles went—He pointeth a moral and adorneth a tale, &c., &c., &c.

BOSTON, April 14, 1856.

Is Fasting one of your public amusements in New York? I don't remember how that is; but it is one of the few recreations we have in New England. And we make the most of it. I am not sure that our Puritan ancestors, when they appointed the institution and made it an heirloom to us, meant it should be kept in the way it is now; but it is kept very religiously—or, at least, heartily. It is my impression that the Gospel injunction is observed very strictly as to the actuality of the mace-ration of the flesh—very few, indeed, "seeming unto men to fast," either from meat or drink—and drink particularly. If they do, they conceal their good works in a commendable and effectual manner. It was observed certainly of many, as a friend of ours who is afflicted with the *Paranomasiasis* or pun-fever (a disease of which I have had no relapse since I had it with the measles and the chicken-pox in childhood) might say, that they spent the day in a *fast* manner, with whatever help fast men and fast horses could give them, and many of them finding themselves fast locked up in the watch-house the next morning. But these accidents, perhaps, arose from our having so few holidays that people do not know what to do with them when they get one.

I wonder whether there is any pretence at fasting on this day in any devout families. It would do many pious people, I know, a world of good, if they could be prevailed upon to forego the flesh-pots, were it only for one day in the three hundred and sixty-five. I remember that in the solemn community where I spent my youth (where I contracted that solemnity of demeanour and discourse which have ever characterized me), under the very droppings of the sanctuary at Andover, we had no regular dinner, at least in the family where I staid. But then we had dough-nuts and cider (for the heresy of the Maine Law had not yet developed itself) *à discrétion*, as the French say, to enable us to get through the day till tea-time, when an opportunity for an ample revenge on the Governor was afforded us, of which the entire household, saints as well as sinners, were not slack to avail themselves. It was a terrible day for us boys, I well remember, in spite of the mitigating dough-nuts and cider, not so much because of the dinner we lacked as of the three sermons, besides domestic doses in the intervals, which were crammed into our ears against the stomach of the sense. I have an impression that it was the theological students that used to be let loose upon us on those days, like young lions kept hungry for the purpose. But I will not make oath of it. I only remember they were terrible fellows, whatever they were.

I don't know how it may be at Andover now, but here the ringing of the Church bells is all that there is to remind one of any religious character appertaining to the day. It is a holiday rather than a holy day and is thoroughly enjoyed by multitudes who are tied down to work-shops or counting-houses on all common days. The Railway trains for the country go out loaded with pleasure-seekers and every living horse is put to his natural use. The theatres are open and crowded, some of them running a day-light service in opposition to the churches, and, it is said, they generally come out several lengths ahead. Still, notwithstanding all the abuses to which they are liable, it would be hard to abolish this "little government Sunday," as some scrupulous persons have suggested. Jack has so much work and so little play in this country that it is no wonder he should so often turn out a dull boy, and it were a pity to take away from him one of his few play-days. But it might be called by some other name more expressive of the actual uses to which it is put. The science of enjoyment is one that needs encouragement more than any other in America. When a man gets a little money or time beforehand he is very apt not to know what to do with it, and to put it to some foolish use out of mere want of knowing better. A lady, awhile ago, founded a Professorship of the Heart at Cambridge; why will not some philanthropist establish one of the Risibles? These muscles ought to receive their share of attention in every scheme of general education.

Fast Day is also remarkable in these parts as the Saturnalia of ministers. On that day they are regarded, by common consent, as free to say what they like on subjects which might disturb the normal slumbers of the pews if agitated on the day set apart for rest. As a general rule, no notice is taken of any freaks they may indulge in or any pranks they may play. They may even remember the fact that there are three or four million of slaves in the country, without being twitted with dragging politics into the pulpit and, perhaps, served with a notice to quit, into the bargain. It is a great relief to them and a very judicious indulgence on the part of the pews. Every housekeeper knows the importance of having a vent for the escape of steam in the covers of their teapots, if it be no bigger than a pin's head, to secure them against explosion. It has now become so much a matter of course that it attracts no attention and I have heard nothing on the subject this year—so I suppose the usual privilege was accorded and enjoyed. I did hear that the Rev. Theodore Parker gave a Discourse of Rifles at the Music Hall to a crowded audience, which kept its attention awake for more than an hour and a half, and was interrupted by repeated rounds of applause. But then he is not exactly in the category of the ministers just alluded to, inasmuch as he does not confine his strictures on public wickednesses to any particular day of the year, but distributes them with laudable impartiality over the whole fifty-two Sundays. It is a mournful sign of the religious state of Boston, that the largest room in the city, if not in the United States, should be filled to overflowing to hear this mischievous dispenser of heresy and sedition, while the regular churches ministered unto by godly, conservative, patriotic men but too often present a dreary expanse of walls.

I told you I remember at the time, of the indignation excited in the neighbouring town of Dorchester by the revolting prayer of the Rev. Mr. Hall last Fourth of July, on the occasion of Mr. Everett's Oration at the Centennial Celebration of the Settlement of the Town. It grieved the righteous souls of many of the saints of that church and town, who deemed it an impertinence that the Almighty should be reminded, particularly on such a day, of the unpleasant circumstance that one-sixth of His children were made beasts, or kept so, by the other five-sixths. Mr. Nahum Capen, formerly and perhaps still a phrenological bookseller, put his pen in rest and tilted at this disturber of the peace of the Zion of Dorchester. But, unluckily, his will was better than his deed and the pragmatical parem carried him to the ground in the encounter. It is painful to have to state that he not only kept his seat on this occasion, but has actually maintained his ground in his parish. This I cannot but regard as of very evil ensample. It is of no use trying to argue with this cross-grained sort. The only thing to do is to put it to the vote—anybody can do that—and pitch them at once out of the pulpit window. But I am happy to say that public justice has not gone entirely unsatisfied in this matter. I told you then also of the just wrath entertained towards Mr. Battles, master of the Everett School, for refusing to march in the procession at the head of his scholars. He was willing they should go if their parents wished it, but declined giving his own countenance to the Celebration, under the circumstances. This, you may remember, created a very great storm (considering the size of the town) in the place, and the contumacious pedagogue was, if not scourged by his own pupils to the meeting, like the one in Livy, at least magnificently burnt in effigy before his own door. There was an attempt made at the time to turn him out of a position in which he set so bad an example to the rising generation; but it unfortunately failed at that time, for some reason or other. You will be glad to hear that he has at last met with his deserts and been dismissed from school, and that young Dorchester is no longer in danger of being perverted by his pernicious heresies. I trust that this awful example will strike terror into the souls of all malignant scholomasters, and unteach them the fatal error that the Civil Liberty established on the Fourth of July permits them to do what they happen to think right; but to do, as was well expounded by that burning and shining light of Religion and of Education, the Rev. Hubbard Winslow, whatever "the voice and will of the brotherhood will allow and protect." Let all such take notice and govern themselves accordingly. D. T.

Our Philadelphia Correspondence.

PHILADELPHIA, April 14, 1856.

MESSRS. EDITORS: There is nothing of especial interest going on in this city at this time. Winter is over, and with it our season for active anti-slavery effort. Business and out-of-door bustle now engross those who, a little while since, had plenty of leisure for meetings, discussions, lectures and other forms of agitation. The Spring is a late one, and everybody is behind-hand with his work; so hurry-scurry is the order of the day.

We had Edward Everett here to deliver his often-repeated lecture on Washington. I did n't go to hear it, but you know what it was. His audience was large and eminently respectable, and the papers were loud in their praise of the discourse. No allusion, of course, was made to the subject which is uppermost now in every reflecting man's thoughts, and the fact of Washington having by will manumitted his slaves was kept out of sight as though it were a blotch upon his memory.

We have a new daily paper in this city called the *Philadelphia Evening Journal*. The publishers and proprietors are Messrs. Grayson, Irwin and Montgomery, of whom the first mentioned is the editor. It is a sort of offshoot from the *North American*, all of these gentlemen having until now been connected with that paper. The first number of the *Journal* is sprightly and full of good reading, but it has nothing to say on the subject of slavery, or any topic growing out of that question. The editor is said to be a liberal and Freedom-loving man, but what his paper will be remains to be seen. A few of our friends are hopeful, but no one that I know is sanguine. Judging from the specimen number, I should say it is not the paper demanded by the times. A journal to suit the present exigency should be, in the language of Rev. Albert Barnes—used in a letter to a friend on this subject—"able, *independent* and *energetic*; one that would reach and mould the minds of the masses in accordance with reason and truth." "I would have," continues Mr. Barnes, "a paper bold and independent; I would have it discuss everything freely; I would have it manly and bold. It should rebuke wrong everywhere; it should vindicate what is right on all subjects; it should take a position on every question which should be clear, intelligent and well defined, so that no one should have any doubt where it was to be found on all the great questions of Temperance, Slavery, human rights, and whatever pertains to the good of our country and of mankind. Such a paper I should be glad to see; and I think that Philadelphia owes it to herself, to her position, character, influence, and intellectual ability to possess such a paper." There are hundreds if not thousands in Philadelphia who fully agree in the views which Mr. Barnes has here so well expressed, and who have been looking forward to the establishment in the city of a paper such as he described; but it is as yet by no means certain that these expectations are to find realization in the *Philadelphia Evening Journal*. However, we shall see.

Our Legislature has done better for us on the subject of Temperance than by many was expected. Instead of the Prohibitory law they have given us a stringent License law, which, not being in advance of public sentiment, is more likely to be executed, and therefore, under the present circumstances, I think adapted to do more good. In Philadelphia and in the large towns of the State, it will certainly prove a more effective measure for the suppression of drunkenness, than the old law which was a dead letter. Legislation in advance of public sentiment, under a democratic form of government, is an absurdity. A law that is not enforced, no matter how desirable it may be in itself considered, is worse than no law.

Our municipal election is approaching, and the talk in political circles turns upon this subject. The present city administration and councils are mainly American or Know-Nothing. Mayor Conrad has outlived his popularity, a short space only being required for that purpose, and the city council have made themselves excessively odious. The prospect is, that there will be a clean sweep, and that a Democratic mayor, with council to match, will be elected in their place. Richard Vaux is the candidate of the Democrats, and the general impression seems to be that he will be our next mayor. He is a man of good intentions, and of respectable antecedents, but is without force of character, and rather frivolous, at least, such is his reputation. Wm. B. Thomas is the Republican candidate for the same office. A very excellent man is Mr. Thomas, and one possessing many qualifications for the place for which he is nominated; but, as there is not much probability of his election, it would be hardly worth while to go into an analysis of his character. K. M. J.

POSITION OF THE TRACT SOCIETY.—An able writer in *The Tribune* has effectually exposed the absurdity and dishonesty of the plea set up by the managers of the American Tract Society, viz.: that while they are constantly issuing tracts against intemperance, tobacco, dancing, sleeping in church, the theatre, &c., they are prohibited from publishing anything against slavery by the general rule which requires them to issue only such works as are "calculated to receive the approbation of all Evangelical Christians." The consequences which follow from this construction of the rule referred to he thus sets forth:

"The more we examine the practical application of the 'fundamental principle' to 'particular immoralities,' the more strange and eccentric does it appear. The American Tract Society has, it seems, full liberty to rebuke Evangelical Christians:

"For sending children to dancing-school—but not for sending them to auction.

"For reading novels—but not for preventing multitudes from reading the Bible.

"For covetousness in general—but not for compelling others to labour for them without wages.

"For trading in intoxicating liquors—but not for trading in the bodies and souls of their fellow-men, or even of their fellow Christians.

"For attending horse-races—but not for driving men and women under the lash to the cotton and sugar fields.

"For drinking wine—but not for robbing millions of all civil and religious freedom.

"For wearing costly apparel—but not for rendering a vast population legally incapable of owning a single garment.

"For visiting the circus—but not for annihilating, by law, the marriage relation.

"For smoking and chewing tobacco—but not for upholding, vindicating and extending a system of compulsory ignorance and degradation, and of unparalleled injustice and cruelty."

THEODORE PARKER ON KANSAS.—We announced, some time previous to the day appointed for the annual Fast in Massachusetts, that the Rev. THEODORE PARKER would on that day preach a discourse to his congregation upon the Kansas question. The discourse was delivered according to the announcement, and we find the following notice of it in the Boston *Telegraph*:

"Rev. Theodore Parker gave a discourse on Kansas in the Music Hall, to a large audience. He took for his text the passage in the Psalms: "The dark places of the earth are full of the habitations of cruelty." The Anglo-Saxon race, he remarked, was the most progressive of any on the globe, and that portion of it settled in the Northern States of this Union had attained to a higher culture and civilization than any other. The civilization tended to develope two ideas—Christianity and Democracy; yet there was in human nature everywhere two antagonistic forces, one of which he should call the progressive and the other the retrogressive, which affected the development of these ideas. In the Northern States the progressive spirit prevailed, and consequently the tendency was to Christianity and Democracy, though they were yet far from that ideal to which they might yet attain. In the Southern States the retrogressive force prevailed, and they were, in consequence, essentially anti-Christian and un-Democratic. The preacher then illustrated the effects of these two forces, by giving statistics of two of the older States—South Carolina and Connecticut—and of two of the newer States—Michigan and Arkansas. Applying these facts to Kansas, he drew a picture of what she would be with slavery and retrogression, or with freedom and progression."

This discourse will be repeated by Mr. Parker before the American Anti-Slavery Society, at the City Assembly Rooms, in this city, on Wednesday evening, May 7th. Those of our friends, in different parts of the country, who have never heard Mr. Parker, will do well to embrace this opportunity.

A SOUTHERN CONFEDERACY.—W. B. Tabor, editor of the Charleston (S. C.) *Mercury*, in a speech at a Kansas meeting, held in that city not long since, openly confessed that the slaveholders had cherished "fond dreams" of a "Southern Confederacy," in which slavery was to find a refuge from the assaults of Abolitionists and "proudly defy the world to strike." This design to overthrow the Union, so often avowed by the supporters of bondage, is not censured by the doughfaces. Their denunciations are reserved for those who would sacrifice the Union rather than see it made an instrument for perpetuating slavery.

"What are we to do? Look on the map for Kansas. See the post she occupies. The North has sixteen States, the South fifteen. In the United States Senate the North casts two votes more than we; the House of Representatives is absolutely of the North. Give them Kansas—they have two more votes in the Senate, and the whole country becomes abolitionized. The same cry swells from Maine to Iowa, "No more slave States!" It goes forth from the pulpit, is the burden of the teachings in Sabbath schools, in every condition, in every stage of life. Let that cry be the precursor of success to its utterers, and farewell to the bright anticipations, the fond dreams for the future of Southern institutions which we have looked forward to seeing embraced in the arms of a *Southern Confederacy*, and proudly defying the world to strike! Kansas lies at the very gate of the West—on the route of the great Pacific Railroad—she stands out a very promontory in the Union. If free institutions gain footing on her soil—if she is added to the ranks of the fanatics, then follow Missouri and Arkansas—all to abolitionism. If Kansas is made free, where next can slavery advance to the West? Not through the Indian territories—not through Iowa—it is swept back and encompassed literally, absolutely."

SLAVE-CATCHING IN ILLINOIS.—The Decatur (Ill.) *Chronicle* states that a man charged with being a fugitive slave was recently arrested at that place and carried off, no one knows where. The Sheriff of the County was the willing instrument in the hands of the claimants; no attempt to appeal to the law was made, the negro being carried off as if he were a stray horse or dog. The Chicago *Tribune* says:

"If this is a true statement of the affair, that Sheriff has laid himself liable to the charge of kidnapping, and should at once be proceeded against with such rigour as his offence demands. It is bad enough for private individuals to engage in the disreputable business of man-hunting, when compelled by the command of an officer under the 'atrocious enactment'; but when State officials, upon their own motion, go into the kidnapping trade, they should be taught that it carries with it pains and penalties that cannot be avoided."

THE UNDERGROUND.—The travel on every branch of this road is more extensive than at any former period, if we may judge from our own observation and the reports we see in the papers. A recent letter from Cincinnati to a New York journal says:

"Emigration to Canada goes on bravely, too. I mentioned in my last two interesting chattels—a mother and child—which riches, having legs, were running off. They staid some time in the city. The day after they left, another pair of chattels—mother and child—came here; the next day another pair, and the next day still another. The same day the Kansas party left, a party of negroes, six in number, arrived here from Kentucky, and last night, with an addition of one, took passage upon the Underground Railroad. The trains are now running regularly, all the necessary repairs upon the road for the season having been made, and everything works smoothly, which is, lamentably, not the case in the political world."

SOUTHERN SELF-COMPLACENCY.—We invite attention to an article in another column, from a North Carolina journal, wherein the editor challenges the admiration of the world for the Judiciary of that State, for the generous self-restraint it exhibited in not hanging a poor coloured man from New York, on the charge of slave-stealing, against whom it was not able to find any satisfactory evidence! Let the North be duly grateful that one of her citizens charged with such an offence, was not hung without proof—nay, without Judge or Jury! Magnanimous slaveholders!

ANTI-SLAVERY DRAMA.—A correspondent of *The Liberator*, writing from Greenmanville, Ct., under date of April 4th, says: "Last evening William Wells Brown read his inimitable drama, entitled 'The Doughface Baked; or, How to get a Back-bone,' to an attentive audience in Floral Hall. The drama cannot but bring its author into notice as a dramatic writer. The characters are drawn to the life. And then, the manner in which Mr. Brown reads carries along with him the audience itself. Let none fail of hearing it when opportunity offers."

LITTELL'S LIVING AGE, No. 620, opens with a timely paper from *Blackwood* upon "Nicaragua and the Fillibusters," and contains eleven other articles of greater or less interest, including an admirably told story, "Balancing the Books," from the *Dublin University Magazine*. New York: 343 Broadway.

ANNIVERSARY WEEK, 1856.

ANTI-SLAVERY MEETINGS,

May 7th and 8th, in the City Assembly Rooms, 446 Broadway (East side), between Howard and Grand streets.

Wednesday Morning, 10 o'clock.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.—Wm. Lloyd Garrison in the chair. Addresses by Wendell Phillips, Charles L. Remond, Lucy Stone Blackwell, and Theodore Parker. Admittance free.

Wednesday Afternoon, 4 o'clock.

AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.—Adjourned meeting for Addresses and Business. Admission free. Among those who will probably take part in this and the subsequent meetings of the Society may be mentioned the names of Wm. Lloyd Garrison, Wendell Phillips, Edmund Quincy, Lucy Stone Blackwell, Samuel J. May, C. C. Burleigh, Wm. Wells Brown, J. M. McKim, C. L. Remond, Lucretia Mott, Abby K. and Stephen S. Foster, Samuel May, Jr., and others.

Wednesday Evening, 7 1-2 o'clock.

AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.—Address by Theodore Parker. Subject: "The Interest of Northern Men in keeping Slavery out of Kansas and Nebraska." Admission 10 cents.

Thursday Morning, 10 o'clock.

AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.—Meeting for Addresses and Business. Admission free.

Thursday Afternoon, 3 o'clock.

AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.—Final meeting for Addresses and Business. Admission free.

Thursday Evening, 7 1-2 o'clock.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE NEW YORK ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.—Addresses by Wm. Lloyd Garrison and Wendell Phillips. Admission 10 cents.

Summary.

Dr. Emily Blackwell, sister of Dr. Elizabeth Blackwell, of New York, has taken her diploma at a medical school in Paris.

The seizure of rifles destined for Kansas will turn out a bad speculation, politically and financially. The boat is to be attached in St. Louis, on its return, for $5,000. The guns were insured for $3,000.

A DARK PROSPECT. — Prentice, of the Louisville *Journal*, has a live American eagle, which he will liberate when Fillmore is President of the United States, and not before. This is actually condemning the poor eagle to imprisonment for life.

General Nye in his speech here, the other evening, made a strong point in referring to Mr. Douglas's threat, "We will subdue you." He said that it was the height of impudence for a man who found himself unable to subdue his own evil and base nature, to talk of subduing the Free North. —*Newark Mercury.*

COUNTY HOUSE MANAGEMENT.—In the County House at Mount Holly, N. J., a few days since, the *Mirror* says, a boy who had committed some act requiring punishment, was put in a cell with a crazy man. Soon after, a wild fit came upon the man, and he seized the boy and killed him in a very short time—mangling him in a shocking manner.

The prospects in New Jersey of a large yield of peaches were never better than at the present time. The buds are generally uninjured, and the lingering cold weather will prevent them from swelling until the season is so far advanced as not to have them suffer from high winds or frosts.

RESIGNATION.—Rev. John Pierpont who has been settled for the past seven years over the Unitarian Society in Medford, has resigned his pastoral charge of that pulpit, and last Sunday preached his farewell sermon. Mr. Pierpont is now 71 years of age, and retires from the Society with the good wishes of all its members and of the citizens of Medford. —*Boston Telegraph.*

THE MAINE LAW IN MAINE.—The Prohibitory law of Maine has at length been repealed, and a new License law enacted in its place. Portland has elected a new Mayor by a small majority. The effects of this change are already beginning to be seen in an increased amount of drunkenness and crime.

We are told by that hypocritical paper, the New York *Observer*, that President Pierce is a praying man. It would not be surprising if, after committing so many heinous sins, he should betake himself to prayer. Murderers generally pray before they bid adieu to the world, and Mr. Pierce is at least an accomplice of murderers.—*Cleveland Leader.*

Joseph Brady, the schoolmaster who was so shamefully treated by a Kentucky mob, has written a letter to the Indianapolis *Journal*, in which he most emphatically declares that he has always voted the Democratic ticket, and that his hatred to slavery commenced with his sojourn in Kentucky about two years ago. He voted for Polk, Cass, and Pierce: and yet a portion of the Ohio Democratic press called him an Abolitionist, and say that the mob served him right!

A DANGEROUS BONNET.—An eminent English physician says:

"I have to lament the great increase amongst the female part of my practice of tic doloreux in the forehead, loss of sight, and great suffering in the ear, induced, I firmly believe, from the present absurd fashion of dressing the neck instead of the head. During the past month I have been in attendance upon two lovely girls with tic doloreux in the forehead, and several others with similar complaints. It is high time the frivolous bonnet of the present day should be done away with."

The *Chicago Democrat*, edited by Hon. John Wentworth, says: "We now are satisfied that neither Mr. Pierce, Mr. Buchanan nor Judge Douglas can get the nomination. They may all three get a majority of the convention on different ballots, but there will be one-third that will be very likely to checkmate either of the three. There is every probability that the party will have to go into the woods again to pick out a new stick, and the chances are some Southern man will be nominated, and if slavery is to be the issue, it is right that a Southern man should be the standard bearer."

IMPORTANT SUIT DECIDED.—The *Fayetteville* (N. C.) *Observer* reports the conclusion of an interesting trial in that County.

"It was an action for libel and conspiracy, in which the plaintiff, Enoch Cobb, a Baptist preacher, claimed $17,000 damages from 96 of the most respectable citizens of Wayne, Duplin and Lenoir Counties, for an alleged combination to drive Cobb out of Duplin—they alleging as a reason that he had incited slaves to house-burning, causing very serious and alarming destruction to property. After some deliberation, the Jury returned a verdict against ten of the defendants for $100—that is, $10 each. There was no evidence to convict the defendants on the count for conspiracy."

A SOUTHERN COLLEGE.—In a South Carolina paper, called the *Southern Enterprise*, appears a letter from Hon. J. B. O'Neall, in which, speaking of South Carolina Colleges and the young men who are educated there, he says: "I graduated in the college forty-three years ago last December. I have been a trustee for thirty-seven years. I know that I have watched over its interests with all the care of a deep and abiding love; and yet I *know that of all the students graduating from* 1806 *to* 1855, *forty-nine years, one-fourth of the whole number have died drunkards*—a shame to themselves and a burden to their families.

Mr. Straight, a member of the large commission house of Straight, Deming & Co., of Cincinnati, lately acted as one of a Committee to present a purse to John Jolliffe, Esq., by way of acknowledgment of his efforts on behalf of the fugitive slaves recently carried back from Cincinnati to Kentucky in defiance of the criminal process of Ohio. This fact having come to the knowledge of a firm in Mobile which had dealings with Straight, Deming & Co., the Mobile firm wrote immediately to the Cincinnati firm for a settlement of accounts.

If settlement of Southern accounts could generally be obtained by that sort of process, we are inclined to think the competition would be very sharp among our New York merchants for membership of such Committees.—*Tribune.*

CONTEMPT OF COURT.—A bill has been reported in Congress granting a jury trial in every case of contempt of Court, the fine to be a stated amount, and the imprisonment for a limited period. This is right. However cautious and liberal courts may have been in the exercise of the power of commitment for contempt, personal liberty is too dear to be subjected to the hazard of any judge's caprice. Every citizen should know the nature of his offence, the extent of the penalty incurred thereby, and have a right to be tried by a jury. Judges themselves, we suppose, would desire to see a statute regulation upon the subject, which would take from the proceeding the arbitrary feature which make this necessary exercise of power so offensive in appearance.—*Phil. Ledger.*

WOMEN STRONGER THAN OXEN.—Let not our fair readers be startled at this, but read its proof in what a distinguished physician says: We withhold the name of the gentleman, to save his professional reputation, because we consider the following a libel on the principle that the greater the truth the greater the libel:

"I anticipate the period when the fairest portion of the fair creation will step forth unencumbered with slabs of walnut or tiers of whalebone. The constitution of our females must be put into withstand, in any tolerable degree, the terrible inflictions of the corset eight hours every day. No animal could survive it. Take the honest ox and enclose his sides with hoop poles, put an oak plank beneath him, and gird the whole with a bed cord, and demand of him labour. He would labour indeed, but it would be for breath."—*Woman's Adv.*

INFAMOUS.—We learn from the *Hingham Journal*, that the office of E. A. Kingsbury, Esq., of Weymouth, was blown up, on Saturday evening last, at about 10 o'clock, with gunpowder, setting the building on fire, and causing great excitement in the village. The fire was extinguished before it had gained much headway, by those who were attracted to the spot by the report of the explosion. A tin canister, which would hold about six pounds of powder, was found on the premises after the explosion. Mr. Kingsbury in his official capacity as Justice of the Peace, has recently ordered the destruction of several parcels of liquor which were brought before him under the liquor law, and it is supposed that the outrage of Saturday night arose from this fact.

CRUSHED OUT.—Mr. Jonathan Battles, Jr., teacher of the Everett School, whose manly and decided courage at the Everett Celebration, on the last Fourth of July in Dorchester, drew down upon him the ire of the crooked-backed and cringing sycophants, who infest that noble town, has finally been removed from the School. The threat of dire vengeance, which was authoritatively pronounced at that time, has at last been executed, and we trust that the heroes of so noble a fight will enjoy the laurels they have won. It is a satisfaction to be able to record in this connection, that the *very reverend gentleman* (!) who took the lead in crushing out Mr. Battles, ventured beyond his depth, and was *drowned* in the popular surge at the last meeting; that is, he was excused (not at his own request) from any further service on the School Committee. We would suggest certain passages in the history of Haman for that individual's consideration.—*Bedham Gazette.*

THE FUGITIVES OF CANADA.—It is now estimated that 30,000 fugitives are already in Canada, chiefly of the class of able-bodied men and women. These, at home, would average in value $1,000, or at least $800, summing up $24,000,000—the absolute loss to the capital of four States. But added to this, there are still remaining in the Northern States, as servants, &c., about six thousand negroes who, not fearing the pursuit, have not crossed into Canada. These, at $1000 each—a low figure for first class slaves, as the runaways almost uniformly are—would add $6,000,000 more—making the aggregate at this time at the lowest calculation $30,000,000 which the slave owners have to lose, and from which they have no resort. Now, the rate of escape to Canada averages twenty persons per day, taking the figures of 1855 as a basis. This would give to 1856, 7,300 persons—which at $800 each, would add $5,840,000 per year, which four States are to suffer in direct loss.

OPPOSITION PRESS IN PENNSYLVANIA.—The Pittsburg *Gazette* states that there are about 120 Opposition papers in Pennsylvania, and gives a list of 109, by name, of which 30 support the Fillmore ticket, 37 hold off, while 42 oppose it. Of the 30 supporting it, some half dozen are cold and equivocal, and will probably abandon it; six or seven of the 37 holding off may be brought to advocate it; and the remainder, it is believed, will sustain the Republican ticket. It says:

"In all the list of journals supporting Fillmore, there is not one of prominence, or one possessing the character and influence accorded to a leading press. They are mainly insignificant country journals; and two of the three Philadelphia papers which head the list hold a very low rank.

"On the other hand; the leading presses of the State, those which have the ear of the people, and whose influence is felt upon public opinion, are arrayed in the class opposed to the ticket. Pennsylvania cannot be effected, against their weight, by a paltry handful of seven by nines."

"RELIGIOUS."—The Hartford *Times* copies from the editorial columns of the *N. Y. Observer*, a malignant article against the free State men of Kansas, and heads it "The Kansas difficulty as viewed by a religious paper." A "religious paper!" But that sheet professes to be religious. We are reminded of a conversation with a Western clergyman, in which he gave some account of a visit he had made to Virginia. While there he spent one or two days with a clergyman who was "religious" much after the fashion of the New York *Observer*. One morning during our friend's visit, this religious man became furiously angry with one of his female slaves for accidentally breaking a pitcher. He took her into a basement room, stripped her back naked, and with a heavy raw hide gave her a terrible flagellation, drawing blood at every stroke. At the second blow the poor creature, writhing with pain, began to exclaim, "Oh! Lord! Oh! Lord!" The holy man paused in his fury; his religion was shocked, and he rebuked her with severity as follows: "You wic

Miscellaneous Department.

GEORGE IV. AND MRS. FITZHERBERT.*

THE private as well as public history of the "most accomplished gentleman of Europe," George IV., is generally acknowledged to be among the most contemptible of modern times. If he did not take off heads, he degraded character and broke hearts with as little compunction as did the notorious "Bluff King Hal," whilst there is scarcely a page in the long catalogue of his offences that does not mark him out as one to whom honour and truth were alike unknown. Mr. Langdale has done good service by bringing before the public further evidence of the dishonourable deeds of this English prince, no less so in vindicating the character of a lady whose amiability and general goodness of heart appear to have stood the test of so much suffering.

Mrs. Fitzherbert was the daughter of a Catholic gentleman, one Walter Smythe, and the widow of two husbands, when, at the age of twenty-five, she first attracted the attention of the Prince of Wales, in 1781, whilst residing at Richmond on an independent income of about £2,000 per annum. Alarmed by the declaration of his passion, the lady removed to the continent—not, however, before she had been led to believe, by a theatrical display of blood-letting and other trickery, that this "accomplished gentleman," even with the help of jovial friends and the bottle, could not possibly live without her. Curious is it to find that all these miserable attempts at delusion was supported by the apparently virtuous members of that aristocracy of which some of us are so proud. Remaining on the continent for a year—receiving continued despatches from couriers, and even the personal interference, by especial desire, of the wicked Egalité, Duke of Orleans—the fluttered, flattered, and too trustful lady returned to England, and here, in the presence of her uncle and her brother, was married to the prince, in accordance with the rites of the Catholic Church, though by a Protestant clergyman. We are further told that "a certificate of this marriage is extant, in the handwriting of the prince, and with his signature and that of Mary Fitzherbert." This marriage, it will be remembered, was denied by Fox, in the House of Commons, when the state of the prince's pecuniary affairs was brought under notice by Alderman Newnham, in the year 1787; and let it be remembered, also, that Fox made the statement on the "positive assurance" of his "royal friend," who had further assurances for his wife that Fox had said so much upon his own authority. In one of his caressing moods, he says to her—"Only conceive, Maria, what Fox did yesterday. He went down to the House, and denied that you and I were man and wife! Did you ever hear of such a thing?" Maria *had* heard of such a thing, and knew that the man who could alone vindicate her honour had not the honesty to do so. She made no reply, but changed countenance and turned pale.

The correct character of the court, during the reign of George III. and our "gracious Queen Charlotte," has always been the theme of loyal compliment; and the fact of Mrs. Fitzherbert's acceptance there, with the knowledge of her relation with the prince, cannot lead the reader to any other supposition than that the marriage was generally understood to have taken place. The Duke of York always remained her warm friend; nor less so the Duke of Clarence, who continued the same kindness after he reached the throne.

"Indeed, she frequently assured me, that there was not one of the royal family who had not acted with kindness to her. She particularly instanced the queen; and, as for George III., from the time she set footing in England till he ceased to reign, had he been her own father he could not have acted towards her with greater tenderness and affection. She had made it her constant rule to have no secrets of which the royal family were not informed by frequent messages of which the Duke of York was generally the organ of communication, and to that rule she attributed at all periods much of her own contentment and ease in extricating herself from embarrassments which would otherwise have been insurmountable. When she had thought that her connection with the prince was broken off forever by his second union, she was soon placed by him in difficulties from the same earnest and almost desperate pursuit as she had been exposed to during the first interval of his attachment. Numbers of the royal family, both male and female, urged a reconciliation, even upon a principle of duty. However, as she was, by his marriage with Queen Caroline, placed in a situation o much difficulty, involving her own conscience, and making it doubtful whether public scandal might not interfere with her own engagements, she determined to resort to the highest authorities of her own church upon a case of such extraordinary intricacy. The Rev. Mr. Nassau, one of the chaplains of Warwick street Chapel, was, therefore, selected to go to Rome and lay the case before that tribunal, upon the express understanding that, if the answer should be favourable, she would again join the prince; if otherwise, she was determined to abandon the country. In the meantime, whilst the negotiation was pending, she obtained a promise from His Royal Highness that he would not follow her into her retreat in Wales, where she went to a small bathing-place. The reply from Rome, in a brief which in a moment of panic she destroyed, fearful of the consequences during Mr. Percival's administration, was favourable to the wishes of the prince; and, faithful to her own determination to act as much as possible in the face of the public, she resisted all opportunities to meet him clandestinely. The day on which she joined him again at her own house was the same on which she gave a public breakfast to the whole town of London, and to which he was invited. She told me she hardly knew how she could summon resolution to pass that severe ordeal, but she thanked God she had the courage to do so. The next eight years were, she said, the happiest of her connection with the prince. She used to say that they were extremely poor, but as merry as crickets; and, as a proof of their poverty, she told me that once, on their returning to Brighton from London, they mustered their common means, and could not raise £5 between them. Upon this, or some such occasion, she related to me that an old and faithful servant endeavoured to force them to accept £60, which he said he had accumulated in the service of the best of masters and mistresses. She added, however, that even this period, the happiest of their lives, was much embittered by the numerous political difficulties which frequently surrounded the prince, and she particularly alluded to what has been termed 'the delicate investigation,' in which Queen Caroline and His Royal Highness had been concerned."

The prince had, in the meantime, shown signs of affection elsewhere; and through the influence of Lady Jersey, accompanied by the pressure of his debts, Mrs. Fitzherbert believed him to have yielded to marriage with the Princess of Brunswick. Mr. Langdale defends the position of the true and loyal against that of the royal wife, on the ground that, as a Catholic, educated in the principles of the Catholic religion, she could admit no distinction between the criminality of a prince or a peasant—in both she looked for the maintenance of the indissoluble and sacred character of the marriage contract. "The presence," he says, "of a Catholic priest would not in any way have added to the validity of the marriage in the eyes of the Catholic Church; and, therefore," he continues, "it is fair to conclude, would not have added to them in those of Mrs. Fitzherbert," whilst the "ceremony having been gone through before a clergyman of the Established Church might naturally have been supposed by Mrs. Fitzherbert to add to its authenticity, if not its legality, in the eyes of those—whether the prince himself, his family, or the country—who professed the same religion." These were the reasons which induced this victim of princely persecution to still cling to him, though she had frequent and serious causes for separation; at length the final blow came, from the Marchioness of Hertford, to whom the royal bigamist now turned his loving eyes. Mrs. Fitzherbert had under her guardianship the child of Lady Horatio Seymour, a warm friend then absent from the country. An attempt being made to remove her little ward, Lord Hertford, as head of the Seymour family, was appeal d to. It was thus that the Marchioness became the rival of Mrs. Fitzherbert, upon whom were now thrown the grossest insults, added to the menace of removing the child whenever obedience was required. Separation would have taken place earlier, but "was prevented by the influence of the royal family."

"A dinner, however, given to Louis XVIII., brought matters at last to a conclusion; and satisfied of a systematic intention to degrade her before the public, she then at last attained the reluctant assent of some of the members of the royal family to her determination of finally closing her connection with the prince, to whom in furtherance of this decision, she never afterwards opened the doors of her house. Upon all former occasions, to avoid etiquette in circumstances of such delicacy as regarded her own situation with reference to the prince, it had been customary to sit at table without regard to rank. Upon the present occasion the plan was to be altered, and Mrs. Fitzherbert was informed through her friends at court, that at the royal table the individuals invited were to sit according to the rank. When assured of this novel arrangement, she asked the prince, who had invited her with the rest of the company, where she was to sit. He said, 'You know, Madam, you have no place.' 'None, sir,' she replied, 'but such as you choose to give me.' Upon this she informed the royal family that she would not go. The Duke of York and others endeavoured to alter the preconcerted arrangement, but the prince was inflexible; and aware of the peculiar circumstances of her case, and the distressing nature of her general situation, they no longer hesitated to agree with her, that no advantage was to be obtained by further postponement of her own anxious desire to close her connection with the prince, and retire once more into private life. She told me she often looked back with wonder that she had not sunk under the trials of those two years. Having come to this resolution, she was obliged on the very evening, or on that which followed the royal dinner, to attend an assembly at Devonshire House, which was the last evening she saw the prince previously to their final separation. The Duchess of Devonshire, taking her by the arm, said to her, 'You must come and see the duke in his own room, as he is suffering from a fit of the gout, but he will be glad to see an old friend.' In passing through the rooms, she saw the prince and Lady Hertford in a *tete-a-tete* conversation, and nearly fainted under all the impressions which then rushed upon her mind, but, taking a glass of water, she recovered and passed on. Thus terminated this fatal, ill-starred connection, so unfortunate, probably, for both the parties concerned."

The Duke of York still clung to Mrs. Fitzherbert as to a sister, and obtained for her £6,000 a year, in a mortgaged deed on the palace at Brighton. George III. and his Consort continued to treat her with great respect, and, during the quarrels between father and son, it was she who frequently became the means of reconciliation; the cruelly-treated Princess Charlotte came to her for consolation, and the worthless husband for advice, when difficulties surrounded him, even after the final separation. On his death-bed she did not forget him, and there is reason to believe that he was buried with her portrait round his neck.

From William IV., as we have before observed, Mrs. Fitzherbert received continued kindness. On reading the documents in proof of her marriage, "he was moved to tears by the perusal, and expressed his surprise at so much forbearance." Declining the honour of being created a Duchess, or of changing a name which she felt had never been disgraced—the assumption of the royal livery, and the wearing of widows' weeds for her royal husband, were distinctly authorised by the King, who frequently invited her to the palace, and placed her in a position amongst the royal family as one of the circle. Similar marks of respect and distinction were accorded to this unfortunate lady by Louis Philippe and his family; the young Duke of Orleans waiting upon her immediately that she had arrived in Paris, "with a thousand kind messages from the King and Queen," and an invitation to the palace, where "nothing could exceed the kindness of their reception."

After the death of the Duke of York, as well as on the death of George IV., the correspondence between Mrs. Fitzherbert and these individuals was destroyed, but certain other documents were "sealed up in a cover, under the seals of the Duke of Wellington, and Sir William Knighton, and of the Earl of Albemarle, and of Lord Stourton. The seals not to be broken without the knowledge of the Duke of Wellington and Sir Wm. Knighton." These documents were lodged in the bank of Messrs. Coutts and Co., and consisted of The mortgage of the Palace at Brighton—The certificate of the marriage, dated 21st December, 1785—Letter from the late King, George IV., relating to the marriage, and signed by him—Will written by George IV.—and, finally, a Memorandum, written by Mrs. Fitzherbert, attached to a letter, written by the clergyman who performed the marriage ceremony."

These documents, Mr. Langdale believes, are alone wanted to prove his case, as defender of the memory of the traduced. The guardians refuse their sanction to the publication of them, on the ground that "it is still very desirable to avoid drawing public attention to, and awakening the subject by public discussion, of the narrations to which the papers relate." Such was the opinion of the Duke of Wellington; who added that the lady, were she living, would feel equally opposed to the documents being disturbed. Those who are the most interested in vindicating her memory, however, think otherwise. Mrs. Fitzherbert died at Brighton, in the year 1837. Over her remains a monument has been raised, by Mrs. L. Dawson Damer—the little ward, Miss Seymour—who acknowledges the departed lady as having been to her "more than a parent." Upon the hand of the figure, forming part of the monument, are three rings, evidence, Mr. Langdale believes, of the faith which Mrs. Damer had in "the triple marriage of her departed friend." One lesson, at all events, we may receive from this book —"Put not your trust in princes."—*Manchester (Eng.) Examiner.*

*Memoirs of Mrs. Fitzherbert, with an Account of her Marriage with H. R. H. the Prince of Wales, afterwards King George the Fourth. By the Hon. Charles Langdale. London: Bentley.

THAT DAY.

BY MRS. E. B. BROWNING.

I STAND by the river where both of us stood;
And there is but one shadow to darken the flood;
And the path leading to it, where both used to pass,
Has the step but of one to take dew from the grass—
One forlorn from that day.

The flowers of the margin are many to see;
For none stoops at my bidding, to pluck from for me;
The bird in the alder sings loudly and long;
For my low sound of weeping disturbs not his song,
As that vow did that day.

I stand by the river; I think of the vow:
Oh! calm as the place is, vow-breaker, be thou!
I leave the flower growing, the bird unreproved:
Would I trouble *thee* rather than them, my beloved,
And my lover that day?

Go! be sure of my love, by that treason forgiven;
Of my prayers, by the blessings they win thee from Heaven;
Of my grief (guess the length of the sword by the sheath's),
By the silence of life, more pathetic than death's:
Go! be clear of that day.

FRANCE AND HER "INFANT."

WHILE hoping for the child that has just entered into this world of troubles and vicissitudes a less checkered and more auspicious fate than has waited upon his predecessors born in the purple, we cannot forget the teachings of history, particularly of the history of France, nor be blind to the many chances which interpose themselves between the cradle and the throne of the baby Emperor. Not a little remarkable is it to observe that, from the accession of Louis XIV. to the present time, not a single King or Governor of France, though none of them, with the exception of Louis XVIII., have been childless, has been succeeded at his demise by his son. Louis XIV. survived his son, his grand-son and several of his great-grand-children, and was succeeded at last by one of the younger children of his grandson, the Duke of Burgundy. Louis XV. survived his son, and was succeeded by his grandson, Louis XVI. Louis XVI. left a son behind him, but that son perished in the filthy dungeon to which the cruelty of the terrorists had confined him. The King of Rome, to whom Napoleon fondly hoped to bequeath the boundless empire he had won, died a colonel in the Austrian service. Louis XVIII. was, we have said, childless. The Duke de Berri fell by the hand of an assassin in the lifetime of Charles X.; and his son, the Duke de Bordeaux, is in exile from the land, which his ancestors regarded as their own estate. The eldest son of Louis Philippe perished by an untimely accident, and his grandson and heir does not sit upon the throne of his grandfather. Thus, then, it appears that for upwards of 200 years, in no one of the dynasties to which France has been subjected has the son succeeded to the throne of the father. We have no claim to offer any opinion with regard to the internal government of France, as now established, and with reference to our own relations with that country have nothing better to wish for than the firm establishment of the dynasty of Louis Napoleon. We have found in the present Emperor's true and loyal ally, a Prince thoroughly alive to the real interests of France and England, and anxious to base his popularity, not upon the miserable expedient of fomenting ancient dislikes and discords, but upon the far more durable and reasonable basis of mutual esteem and good understanding. Whatever contributes to his welfare, confirms his power, and tends to perpetuate his rule, must be regarded as no less interesting to England than to France.

But we are compelled to admit that, many chances lie between the infant heir of the Emperor and the Empire itself. Should the present Emperor survive and perpetuate his power till his son has arrived at those years which entitle him to take upon himself the duties of the Government, one main difficulty would, undoubtedly, be overcome, but others remain behind, of an equally formidable nature. Were France an hereditary monarchy like England, where the Sovereign is exempted by the very terms of the Constitution from responsibility for his acts, and is bound to govern by the advice of his ministers, whatever be the character of the new-born child, we might confidently predict that he would ascend and occupy the throne of his father. Nay, were he a despotic monarch, like the Emperor of Russia, who rules not only by the fears but by the veneration and fanaticism of his subjects, he might also, probably, succeed, with no heavier liability than that having his career cut short, should he govern in a manner to displease the most prominent and powerful of his subjects. But, in France, government is neither founded on prescription, as with us, nor on superstition, as in Russia. The qualities which secure obedience in France seem now to be purely personal, and little is gained by birth, unless it be united with those qualities which conciliate the respect and compel the obedience of mankind. It is not every Philip that can hope to be succeeded by an Alexander—not every man of good capacity who can expect to be ripe for the most difficult situation in the world in the first years of opening manhood. Amid the shipwreck of so many dynasties, amid the blasting of so many fair prospects of success, it were presumptuous to anticipate for this last child of a reigning family that good fortune which has been denied to so many of his predecessors. Who does not remember the prophetic poem in which Beranger represents the son of the great Napoleon as warning the youthful Duke de Bordeaux of the snares and difficulties that surround the path of the future heir of the French diadem? "Fortune," writes the heir of the empire to the heir of the Restoration, "stretches to you a hand, and smiles upon your birth. My first day also was fair. Kings adored me in my cradle, and yet I am in Vienna. I slept upon laurels, and you are wrapt in purple; sceptres were my playthings, my head was bound with a crown, the marshals swore fidelity to me—an oath which they have, doubtless kept—and yet I am in Vienna." The lessons of history on this subject are so exceedingly striking and appropriate, that it is impossible for an impartial writer to consider such an event as the present without alluding to them. And yet, if we were permitted to dwell in the land of hope rather than in that of reality, how gladly would we believe that in the birth of this infant, at the very moment that gives renewed peace to Europe, we find a pledge for the termination of those incessant convulsions which, from the assembly of the States-General under Louis XVI., have, at longer or shorter intervals, never failed to agitate the Government and people of France.—*London Times.*

BARBARA.

BY ALEXANDER SMITH.

On the Sabbath day,
Through the churchyard old and gray.
Over the crisp and yellow leaves, I help my rustling way;
And amid the works of mercy, falling on the soul like balms;
'Mong the gorgeous storms of music in the mellow organ calms;
'Mong the upward-streaming prayers, and the rich and solemn psalms,
I stood heedless, Barbara!

My heart was otherwise,
While the organ fill'd the air,
And the priest with outspread hands bless'd the people with a prayer.
But when rising to go homeward, with a mild and saint-like shine
Gleam'd a face of airy beauty with its heavenly eyes on mine—
Gleam'd and vanish'd in a moment. O, the face was like to thine,
Ere you perish'd, Barbara!

O, that pallid face!
Those sweet, earnest eyes of grace!
When last I saw them, dearest, it was in another place;
You came running forth to meet me with my love-gift on your wrist,
And a curs'd river killed thee, aided by a murderous mist.
Oh, a purple mark of agony was on the mouth I kiss'd,
When last I saw thee, Barbara!

Those dreary years, eleven,
Have you pined within your heaven,
And is this the only glimpse of earth that in that time was given?
And have you pass'd unheeded all the fortunes of your race—
Your father's grave, your sister's child, your mother's quiet face—
To gaze on one who worshipp'd not within a kneeling place?
Are you happy, Barbara?

'Mong angels do you think
Of the precious golden link
I bound around your happy arm while sitting on yon brink?
Of when that night of wit and wine, of laughter and guitars,
Was emptied of its music, and we watch'd through lattice-bars
The silent midnight heaven moving o'er us with its stars.
Till the morn broke, Barbara!

In the years I've changed,
Wild and far my heart has ranged,
And many sins and errors deep have been on me avenged;
But to you I have been faithful, whatsoever good I've lack'd;
I loved you, and above my life still hangs that love intact,
Like a mild consoling rainbow o'er a savage cataract.
Love has saved me, Barbara!

O Love! I am unblest,
With monstrous doubts oppress
Of much that's dark and nether, much that's holiest and best.
Could I but win you for an hour from off that starry shore,
The hunger of my soul were still'd; for Death has told you more
Than the melancholy world doth know—things deeper than all love.
Will you teach me, Barbara?

In vain, in vain, in vain!
You will never come again:
There droops upon the dreary hills a mournful fringe of rain,
The gloaming closes slowly round, unblest winds are in the tree,
Round selfish shores for ever moans the hurt and wounded sea:
There is no rest upon the earth, peace is with Death and thee,—
I am weary, Barbara!

THE LAST DAYS OF JEFFREYS, ONE OF THE ATROCIOUS JUDGES.

AMONG the many offenders whose names were mentioned in the course of these inquiries was one who stood alone and unapproached in guilt and infamy, and whom whigs and tories were willing to leave to the extreme rigour of the law. On that terrible day which was succeeded by the Irish Night, the roar of a great city disappointed of its revenge had followed Jeffreys to the drawbridge of the Tower. His imprisonment was not strictly legal; but he at first accepted with thanks and blessings the protection which those dark walls, made famous by so many crimes and sorrows, afforded him against the fury of the multitude. Soon, however, he became sensible that his life was still in imminent peril.

For a time he flattered himself with the hope that a writ of "habeas corpus" would liberate him from his confinement, and that he should be able to steal away to some foreign country, and to hide himself, with part of his ill-gotten wealth, from the detestation of mankind; but, till the government was settled, there was no court competent to grant a writ of "habeas corpus"; and, as soon as the government had been settled, the "habeas corpus" act was suspended. Whether the legal guilt of murder could be brought home to Jeffreys may be doubted. But he was morally guilty of so many murders, that if there had been no other way of reaching his life, a retrospective Act of Attainder would have been clamorously demanded by the whole nation. A disposition to triumph over the fallen has never been one of the besetting sins of Englishmen; but the hatred of which Jeffreys was the object was without a parallel in our history, and partook but too largely of the savageness of his own nature.

The people, where he was concerned, was as cruel as himself, and exulted in his misery as he had been accustomed to exult in the misery of convicts listening to the sentence of death, and of families clad in mourning. The rabble congregated before his deserted mansion in Duke street, and read on the door, with shouts of laughter, the bill which announced the sale of his property. Even delicate women, who had tears for highwaymen and housebreakers, breathed nothing but vengeance against him. The lampoons on him which were hawked about the town were distinguished by an atrocity rare even in those days. Hanging would be too mild a death for him; a grave under the gibbet too respectable a resting place; he ought to be whipped to death at the cart's tail; he ought to be devoured alive.

The street poets portioned out all his joints with cannibal ferocity, and computed how many pounds of steaks might be cut from his well-fattened carcass. Nay, the rage of his enemies was such that, in language seldom heard in England, they proclaimed their wish that he might go to the place of wailing and gnashing of teeth, to the worm that never dies, to the fire that is never quenched. They exhorted him to hang himself in his garters, and to cut his throat with a razor. They put up horrible prayers that he might not be able to repent, that he might die the same hard-hearted, wicked Jeffreys that he had lived. His spirit, as mean in adversity as insolent and inhuman in prosperity, sank down under the load of public abhorrence. His constitution, originally bad, and much impaired by intemperance, was completely broken by distress and anxiety.

He was tormented by a cruel internal disease, which the most skilful surgeons of that age were seldom able to relieve. One solace was left him—brandy. Even when he had causes to try and councils to attend, he had seldom gone to bed sober. Now, when he had nothing to occupy his mind, save terrible recollections and terrible forebodings, he abandoned himself without reserve to his favourite vice. Many believed him to be bent on shortening his life by excess. He thought it better, they said, to go off in a drunken fit than to be kicked by Ketch, or torn limb from limb by the populace.

Once he was roused from a state of abject despondency by an agreeable sensation, speedily followed by a mortifying disappointment. A parcel had been left for him at the Tower; it appeared to be a barrel of Colchester oysters, his favourite dainties. He was greatly moved: for there are moments when those who least deserve affection are pleased to think that they inspire it. "Thank God," he exclaimed, "I have still some friends left!" He opened the barrel; and from among a heap of shells out tumbled a stout halter.

It does not appear that one of the flatterers or buffoons whom he had enriched out of the plunder of his victims came to comfort him in the day of trouble. But he was not left in utter solitude. John Tutchin, whom he had sentenced to be flogged every fortnight for seven years, made his way into the Tower, and presented himself before the fallen opposer. Poor Jeffreys, humbled to the dust, behaved with abject civility, and called for wine. "I am glad, sir," he said, "to see you." "And I am glad," answered the resentful whig, "to see you in this place." "I served my master," said Jeffreys; "I was bound in conscience to do so." "Where was your conscience," said Tutchin, "when you passed that sentence on me at Dorchester?" "It was set down in my instructions," answered Jeffreys, fawningly, "that I was to show no mercy to men like you, men of parts and courage. When I went back to court, I was reprimanded for my lenity."

Even Tutchin, acrimonious as was his nature, and great as were his wrongs, seems to have been a little mollified by the pitiable spectacle which he had at first contemplated with vindictive pleasure. He always denied the truth of the report that he was the person who sent the Colchester barrel to the Tower.

A more benevolent man, John Sharp, the excellent Dean of Norwich, forced himself to visit the prisoner. It was a painful task, but Sharp had been treated by Jeffreys, in olden times, as kindly as it was the nature of Jeffreys to treat anybody, and had once or twice been able, by patiently waiting until the storm of curses and invectives had spent itself, and by dexterously seizing the moment of good-humour, to obtain for unhappy families some mitigation of their sufferings. The prisoner was surprised and pleased. "What!" he said; "dare you own me now?"

It was in vain, however, that the amiable divine tried to give a salutary pain to that seared conscience. Jeffreys, instead of acknowledging his guilt, exclaimed vehemently against the injustice of mankind. "People call me a murderer for doing what at the time was applauded by some who are now high in public favour. They call me a drunkard, because I take punch to relieve me in my agony." He would not admit that, as President of the High Commission, he had done anything that deserved reproach. His colleagues, he said, were the real criminals; and now they threw all the blame on him. He spoke with peculiar asperity of Spat, who had undoubtedly been the most humane and moderate member of the board.

It soon became clear that the wicked judge was fast sinking under the weight of bodily and mental suffering. Doctor John Scott, prebendary of Saint Paul's, a clergyman of great sanctity, and author of the Christian Life, a treatise once widely renowned, was summoned, probably on the recommendation of his intimate friend Sharp, to the bedside of the dying man. It was in vain, however, that Scott spoke, as Sharp had already spoken, of the hideous butcheries of Dorchester and Taunton. To the last, Jeffreys continued to repeat those who thought him cruel did not know what his orders were, that he deserved praise instead of blame, and that his clemency had drawn on him the extreme displeasure of his master.

Disease, assisted by strong drink and misery, did its work fast. The patient's stomach rejected all nourishment. He dwindled, in a few weeks, from a portly and even corpulent man to a skeleton. On the 18th of April he died, in the 41st year of his age. He had been Chief Justice of the King's Bench at 35, and Lord Chancellor at 37. In the whole history of the English bar there is no other instance of so rapid an elevation, or so terrible a fall. The emaciated corpse was laid, with all privacy, next to the corpse of Monmouth in the chapel of the Tower.—*Macaulay's History of England.*

TWO OF MONK LEWIS'S STORIES.

In Monk Lewis's writings there is a deal of bad taste; but still he was a man of genius. I'll tell you two stories which he was very fond of repeating (and which Windham used to like). The first is:

THE SKELETON IN THE CHURCH-PORCH.—Some travellers were supping at an inn in Germany, and sent for the landlord to give him a glass of wine. In the course of conversation the landlord remarked that a certain person whom they happened to speak of, was as obstinate as the Skeleton in the Church-porch. "What is that?" they inquired. The landlord said that he alluded to a skeleton which it was impossible to keep under ground; that he had twice or thrice assisted in laying it in the charnel, but that always, the day after it had been buried, it was found lying in the church-porch. The travellers were greatly struck by this account; and they expressed an eager desire to see the refractory skeleton. At last, a young serving-woman coming into the room, they asked her if she, for a reward, would go to the church-porch and bring the skeleton to them. She at first refused to do so; but eventually the travellers offered a sum of money which she could not resist. Be it particularly observed that the young woman was then *big with child.* Well, off she set to the church; and having found the skeleton in its usual place, she brought it to the inn on her back, and laid it upon the table before the travellers. They had no sooner looked at it than they wished it gone; and they prevailed on the young woman, for another sum of money, to carry it again to the church-porch. When she arrived there, she set it down; and turning away, she was proceeding quickly along the path which led from the church, and which was seen stretching out before her in the clear moonlight, when suddenly she felt the skeleton leap upon her back. She tried to shake it off; but in vain. She then fell on her knees, and said her prayers. The skeleton relaxed its hold; and she again rushed down the path, when, as before, the skeleton leapt upon her back. "I will never quit you," it said, "until you descend into the charnel, and obtain forgiveness for the skeleton that lies in the church-porch." She paused a moment; then summoning up her courage, she replied that she would do so. The skeleton dropped off. Down she went into the charnel; and, after groping about for some time, she perceived the pale figure of a lady, sitting by a lamp and reading. She advanced towards the figure, and kneeling, said, "I ask forgiveness for the skeleton that lies in the church-porch." The lady read on without looking at her. Again she repeated her supplication, but still the lady read on, regardless of it. The young woman then ascended from the charnel, and was running down the path when the skeleton once more arrested her progress. "I will never quit you," it said, "till you obtain forgiveness for the skeleton that lies in the church-porch: go again into the charnel, and ask it." Again the young woman descended, and, advancing to the lady, sunk upon her knees, and cried, "I come a second time to ask forgiveness for the skeleton that lies in the church-porch. Oh, grant that forgiveness! the skeleton implores it, I implore it! *the babe that I bear in my womb implores it!*" The lady turned her head towards the speaker, gave a faint smile, and disappeared. On coming up from the charnel, the young woman found the skeleton standing erect in the porch. "I am now here," it said, "not to trouble you, but to thank you; you have at length procured me rest in the grave. I was betrothed to the lady you saw in the charnel; and I basely deserted her for another. I stood at the altar, about to be married to my second love, when suddenly the lady rushed into the church, and having stabbed herself with a dagger, said to me, as she was expiring, "you shall never have rest in the grave—no, never, *till the babe unborn shall ask forgiveness for you.*" The skeleton rewarded the good offices of the young woman by discovering to her the place where a heap of treasure was concealed.

The second story is:

LORD HOWTH'S RAT.—Tom Sheridan was shooting on the moors in Ireland, and lost his dog. A day or two after, it made its appearance, following an Irish labourer. It was restored to Sheridan, who remarked to the labourer that "the dog seemed very familiar with him." The answer was, "Yes, it follows me, as the rat did Lord Howth." An inquiry about the rat drew forth what is now to be told. Lord Howth, having dissipated his property, retired in very low spirits to a lonely chateau on the sea-coast. One stormy night a vessel was seen to go down; and next morning a raft was beheld floating towards the shore. As it approached, the bystanders were surprised to find that it was guided by a lady, who presently stepped upon the beach. She was exquisitely beautiful; but they were unable to discover who or what she was, for the spoke in an unknown tongue. Lord Howth was struck with pity for this fair stranger, and conducted her to his chateau. There she remained for a considerable time, when he became violently enamoured of her, and at last asked her to become his wife. She (having now learned the English language) thanked him for the honour he had intended her; but declared in the most positive terms that she could never be his. She then earnestly advised him to marry a certain lady of a neighbouring county. He followed her advice; paid his addresses to the lady, and was accepted. Before the marriage, the beautiful stranger took a ribbon from her hair, and binding it round the wrist of Lord Howth, said, "Your happiness depends on your never parting with this ribbon." He assured her that it should remain constantly on his wrist. She then disappeared, and was never seen again. The marriage took place. The ribbon was a matter of much wonder and curiosity to the bride; and one night, when Lord Howth was asleep, she removed it from his wrist, and carried it to the fire, that she might read the characters inscribed upon it. Accidentally she let the flame reach it, and it was consumed. Some time after, Lord Howth was giving a grand banquet in his hall, when the company were suddenly disturbed by the barking of dogs. This, the servants said, was occasioned by a rat which the dogs were pursuing. Presently the rat, followed by the dogs, entered the hall. It mounted on the table, and running up to Lord Howth, stared at him earnestly with its bright black eyes. He saved its life: and from that moment it never quitted him: wherever he was, alone or with his friends, there was the rat. At last the society of the rat became very disagreeable to Lord Howth; and his brother urged him to leave Ireland for a time, that he might get rid of it. He did so, and proceeded to Marseilles, accompanied by his brother. They had just arrived at that place, and were sitting in the room of an hotel, when the door opened, and in came the rat. It was dripping wet, and went straight to the fire to dry itself. Lord Howth's brother, greatly enraged at the intrusion, seized the poker, and dashed out its brains. "You have murdered me," cried Lord Howth, and instantly expired.—*Rogers's Table-Table.*

*WORCESTER'S DICTIONARY.**

THE duties of a lexicographer are nowhere "written down," as Dogberry has it. Like the principles of Common Law, they may be gathered from libraries of precedents, but they are not defined by the statute; and it follows in fact, if not in reason, that the practice of the dictionary-makers varies with their respective fancies and caprices. Speaking generally, we hold that the duty of a lexicographer is not to legislate, but to record; not to ordain what language shall be, but faithfully to state what it is. We demur to the assumption that any one man, especially if a self-appointed teacher, is entitled to dictate philology to a community. The usage of good writers generally, not the conceits of one man in particular, must decide what words belong to the language, what they signify, and how they should be spelled. The latter department, however, requires the greatest precision; for the admission of a word into the vocabulary may be debateable, and it may have more than one meaning when admitted; but its spelling should be fixed with reasonable exactness.

Whatever the lexicographers may claim as their prerogative or their achievement, we know that, independently of them all, general usage has dropped the *k* from such word as *music* and *physic*; and that at present it is retained only in those words of more than one syllable which, in their derivatives, require it to be retained for the security of their pronunciation. As, for example, *mimic*, as a primitive, is spelled without the *k*, but the derivatives, *mimicking, mimicked*, cannot dispense with it. Again, general usage in America had dropped the *u* from *favor* and *honor*, although in England it is generally retained. There seems to be less of reason in this change: for while the *c* and *k* of *musick* have the same sound, and, one of them, therefore, is, in an orthoepical sense, superfluous; the *o* and *u* of *favour* have not the same sound, and the propriety of the change is made questionable from the fact the letter dropped is the only one pronounced. Besides, if so-called superfluity is a valid reason for expunging letters, a glance will show that the *o* of *serious*, etc., etc., is more truly superfluous than the *u* of *favour*; and, thence, carry out the rule to its limits, and every man would soon be his own orthographer. We protest against this assumption of superfluity; and claim that a letter is by no means superfluous, merely because it is silent.

Dr. Worcester's views of orthography seem to be sound. He follows, and does not attempt to direct, the usage of good writers. He remarks, "in cases where good usage is divided, etymology and analogy have been consulted in deciding" which to adopt. These cases are substantially limited to the two classes of words we have have cited, *music* and *favor*; and Worcester spells the former without the *k* and the latter without the *u*; and in our longitude he is perhaps correct in so doing. We are glad to see that he does *not* omit the *u* of *mould* and *moult*; nor the second *l* from *travelling, marvellous, counsellor*, and so on. He also pays due respect to reason and usage in the spelling of *theatre, spectre, centre*, &c. Indeed, so far as we have examined his book, it seems to be free from all modern radicalism in its orthography.

The vocabulary of this dictionary is a sufficient record of contemporaneous English. Words obsolete, forgotten and utterly useless, are omitted; and some of the possible combinations of letters, in the manufacture of derivatives, are dispensed with; but, all that are really wanted, are here; and the book, therefore, is of a convenient size for a manual of reference.

In pronunciation, Dr. Worcester also follows usage and the example of his predecessors; hazarding nothing of his own, except some suggestions, as to the manner of making the vowels, to indicate or express sounds already established.

Worcester's definitions are simple and lucid, and as satisfactory as those of other lexicographers; but we are not quite sure that the principles of definition have been carried out. What is the precise object of definitions in a dictionary? Primarily, doubtless, to state the meanings of words. But the difficulty seems to lie in ascertaining how much the readers of a dictionary already know, that the lexicographer may withhold all superfluous information. Take, for example, the word *fork*. *Johnson* defines fork, "an instrument divided at the end into two or more points or prongs, and used on many occasions." *Walker* quotes this verbatim, excepting the last five words. The Burlington Dictionary, of 1813, is equally intelligible. *Webster* says: "An instrument consisting of a handle and a blade of metal, divided into two or more points or prongs." *Richardson* says: "Anything so divided as to have two or more pointed prongs." *Worcester*, in the book now under review, quotes Walker *verbatim*.

Now, this kind of definition is very well for those who already know more; but how much information does it convey, to those who know less? If we were to undertake the definition of *fork*, we should assume that the dictionary student was in pursuit of knowledge; and, if we were writing for American longitude, we should be apt to improve on Johnson's hint of *use*. We should say, fork (table); the counterpart of a table-knife; practically, a split spoon; an instrument used, at meals, to hold meat on the plate when it is being cut with the knife; and also *always used by well-bred people in conveying meat and vegetables to the mouth*. For *pitch-fork, meat-fork, carving-fork*, etc., see, in alphabetical order. Perhaps this is an extreme case of ambiguity on the part of lexicographers, and of perspicuity on ours. But there are many instances, in all dictionaries, where a foreigner, meeting with a word in a book, and looking for its signification in a dictionary, would gain very little information by the search. In the case of *fork*, he would certainly be mystified.

Worcester says, in his preface, "A new and peculiar feature has been given to this dictionary, by bringing into view the principal *synonymes* of the language. The notices of the synonymes are necessarily short; yet, brief as they are, it is believed that they will be of essential service to the student in enabling him to understand the meaning and proper use of these words." And, as an illustration, we quote from the body of the work:

"LAWYER, one versed in law; an attorney. *Syn. Lawyer* is a general term for one who is versed in, or practises, law. *Barrister, counsellor* and *counsel* are terms applied to lawyers who advise and assist clients, and plead for them in a court of justice. An *attorney* is a lawyer who acts for another, and prepares cases for trial. An *advocate* is a lawyer who argues causes. A *special-pleader* is one who partakes the written pleadings in a cause. A *chamber counsellor* is a lawyer who gives advice in his office, but does not act in court. A *conveyancer* is one who draws writings, by which real estate is transferred. *Civitian* and *jurist* are terms applied to such as are versed in the science of the law, particularly civil or Roman law. A *solicitor* is a lawyer employed in a chancery court. A *publicist* is a writer on the laws of nature and nations."

We cannot here, nor at present, go into an elaborate examination of this new book. It is a great acquisition to the language, because it can be relied on in all the essentials. It is to the present generation what Walker's dictionary was in its day—a standard vocabulary of English words, pronounced and spelled in conformity to good usage, and defined with at least conventional accuracy and clearness. In fact, the definitions of Worcester are the best hitherto—as they should be; he had the advantage of the experience and the mistakes of his predecessors, and it is but just to add that the other departments are similarly, and for the same reason, improved. Higher commendation than this cannot well be bestowed on a dictionary. Johnson says: "Every other writer may aspire to praise; the lexicographer can only hope to escape reproach."—*Evening Post.*

*A Pronouncing, Explanatory and Synonymous Dictionary of the English Language. By Joseph E. Worcester, LL.D. 8vo., pp. 905. Boston: Hickling, Swan & Brown. 1860.

A LAY OF REAL LIFE.

BY TOM HOOD.

"Some are born with a wooden spoon in their mouths, and some with a golden ladle."—*Goldsmith.*

"Some are born with tin rings in their noses, and some with silver ones."—*Silversmith.*

WHO ruined me ere I was born,
Sold every acre, grass or corn,
And left the next heir all forlorn?
My Grandfather.

Who said my mother was no nurse,
And physicked me and made me worse,
Till infancy became a curse?
My Grandm